on-Partisan Discussion of International Movements

World Unity

LEADING ARTICLES

The World Challenge to the United States—*Editorial*
The Permanent Court of International Justice—*Hughes*
Pan-America in the Coming World Order—*Stuart*
Education and World Culture—*Overstreet*
Confucius and the War Lords—*Miller*

nterpreting
the spirit of the new age

"When the world presents its population with the problem of difficulty in making a living, then it is time for the existing social order to beware."—*Nicholas Murray Butler*

35 cents January 1931

A STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

World Unity Magazine, as its title implies, will endeavor to interpret and record those significant changes in present-day thought which mark the trend toward worldwide understanding and a humanized civilization able to release the finer aspirations of mankind.

Its essential purpose is to make accessible to awakened minds the views and conclusions of creative workers on subjects of truly general interest and importance. The emergence of new and higher values in philosophy, science, religion, ethics and the arts from the alembic of universal unrest represents the focal point of vision for World Unity Magazine.

To create a medium capable of responding faithfully, without prejudice of race, creed, class or nationality, to the uprush of the spirit of the age wherever or however manifested—this is the ideal to which World Unity Magazine is devoted; and faith in humanity arising at last to assert its organic oneness, the foundation on which it stands.

Constructive suggestions will be heartily welcomed from progressive individuals and organizations to assist the Magazine to fulfill its function as a clearing-house of ideas and plans reflecting the organic trends of the age toward world unity and cooperation. The Magazine will endeavor to publish significant articles of a stimulating character, without assuming responsibility for its contributors' views.

WORLD UNITY means . . . .

Education brought back to the control of life

EVERY believer in human progress will appreciate these facts: (1) that the breakdown in the world's political structure in 1914 was caused by failure in the field of public education; and (2) that it is likewise through the result of inadequate education that people everywhere are suffering from the economic collapse of 1929.

Education must control life once more, as education controlled life in the creative ages of India, China, Greece, Rome and Medieval Europe. An education that attempts to deal with individuals and not with society merely sharpens the sword of anarchy and prepares the ground for public chaos.

Generations may be required for the complete regeneration of educational ideals and facilities organized around the new concept of world community. Meanwhile, every parent, every teacher and every matured, responsible student has the privilege of supplementing his or her present education with the knowledge of world affairs and world trends provided by World Unity Magazine.

World Unity is the product of international scholarship working in the fields of Science, Philosophy, Economics, Politics, Art and Religion—in other words, knowledge related directly to the problems of immediate social evolution. Over this bridge between helpless theory and brutal fact you can pass to new mental regions of understanding and assurance.

Write for free booklet, or sample copy at 25c, or yearly subscription at $3.50 (to Libraries, $2.50). Special Introductory Subscription, four months for $1.00. Also request information about the three volumes in the famous "World Unity Library."

WORLD UNITY MAGAZINE

JOHN HERMAN RANDALL, *Editor* HORACE HOLLEY, *Managing Editor*

4 East 12th Street, New York

NAMES WHICH MEAN THE WORLD OUTLOOK IN SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Authors and Contributing Editors of World Unity Magazine

AMERICA

Devere Allen
C. F. Ansley
W. W. Atwood
Robert W. Bagnall
Alice A. Bailey
Gerrit A. Beneker
Ernest M. Best
Edwin Arthur Burtt
Harry Charlesworth
Rudolph I. Coffee
John J. Coss
John Dewey
Herbert Adams Gibbons
James Gordon Gilkey
Charlotte Perkins Gilman
W. N. Guthrie
Frank H. Hankins
A. Eustace Haydon
Carleton J. H. Hayes
Hubert C. Herring
Horace Holley
Arthur E. Holt
Hamilton Holt
Manley O. Hudson
Mary Hull
Mordecai W. Johnson
Chester Lloyd Jones
Rufus M. Jones
David Starr Jordan
Vladimir Karapetoff
Kenneth S. Latourette
Harry Levi
Alain Locke
Robert Morss Lovett
Louis L. Mann
Alfred W. Martin
Kirtley F. Mather
Lucia Ames Mead
Fred Merrifield
Herbert A. Miller
Parker T. Moon
Harry Allen Overstreet
Archie M. Palmer
Dexter Perkins
John Herman Randall
John Herman Randall, Jr.
M. D. Redlich
Carl A. Ross
Joseph S. Roucek
Moises Saenz
Nathaniel Schmidt
William R. Shepherd
Mary Siegrist
Abba Hillel Silver
Isidor Singer
George M. Stratton
Norman Thomas
Augustus O. Thomas
Isabella Van Meter
Frank Lloyd Wright

EUROPE

Norman Angell
A. Mendelsohn Bartholdy
L. F. de Beaufort
Pierre Bovet
J. Tyssul Davis
Georges Duhamel
Anna B. Eckstein
Havelock Ellis
Auguste Forel
V. Schultze Gävernitz
Hellmuth von Gerlach
John W. Graham
Marja Grundmann-Koscienska
Will Hayes
Ernest Judet
Hans Kohn
Richard Lee
Ernest Ludwig
George de Lukács
Sir James Marchant
Victor Margueritte
R. H. Markham
F. S. Marvin
Karin Michaelis
Ida Müller
Emanuel Radl
Forrest Reid
Paul Richard
Charles Richet
Th. Ruyssen
Gilbert Thomas
Rustum Vámbéry
Walter Walsh
Hans Wehberg
M. P. Willcocks

THE ORIENT

Ramananda Chatterji
Ng Poon Chew
James H. Cousins
Taraknath Das
Bayard Dodge
C. F. Gates
Kahlil Gibran
Yamato Ichihashi
S. L. Joshi
P. W. Kuo
Dhan Gopal Mukerji
Yone Noguchi
S. G. Pandit
Frank Rawlinson
Stanley Rice
Nicholas Roerich
A. J. Saunders
David G. Stead
J. Vijaya-Tunga

WORLD UNITY

A Monthly Magazine
for those who seek the world outlook

JOHN HERMAN RANDALL, *Editor*
HORACE HOLLEY, *Managing Editor*

CONTENTS

JANUARY, 1931

Pan-American Building — *Frontispiece*
The World Challenge to the United States — *Editorial*
The Permanent Court of International Justice — *Charles Evans Hughes*
Elements of a World Culture
III. Education — *H. A. Overstreet*
The International Note in Novels (concluded) — *A. Evelyn Newman*
Pan-America in the Coming World Order — *Graham H. Stuart*
'Round the World Log of a Sociologist
III. Confucius and the War Lords — *Herbert A. Miller*
Peace by Promises — *Dexter Perkins*
Leaves of the Greater Bible
V. Buddhist Prayers — *William Norman Guthrie*
The United States of Europe — *John Herman Randall, Jr.*

Round Table

(Contents indexed in the International Index to Periodicals)

WORLD UNITY MAGAZINE is published by WORLD UNITY PUBLISHING CORPORATION, 4 East 12th Street, New York City: MARY RUMSEY MOVIUS, *president;* HORACE HOLLEY, *vice-president;* FLORENCE MORTON, *treasurer;* JOHN HERMAN RANDALL, *secretary.* Published monthly, 35 cents a copy, $3.50 a year in the United States and in all other countries (postage included). THE WORLD UNITY PUBLISHING CORPORATION and its editors welcome correspondence on articles related to the aims and purposes of the magazine. Printed in U. S. A. Contents copyrighted 1931 by WORLD UNITY PUBLISHING CORPORATION.

Photograph by Underwood & Underwood

PAN-AMERICAN BUILDING AT WASHINGTON

WORLD UNITY MAGAZINE

Vol. VII January, 1931 No. 4

EDITORIAL

THE WORLD CHALLENGE TO THE UNITED STATES

After five years' attempt to reach some agreement, the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament has finally drawn up a "skeleton" convention which will be submitted to a World Disarmament Conference to be held, it is now hoped, not later than 1932. It suggests what armament can be eliminated and how to limit, but it remains for the World Conference to determine how much each State shall limit its armaments on this basis.

That the program agreed upon falls far short of what has been hoped is self-evident. After years of talk and subterfuge, for the Commission to have made no greater progress amounts almost to a confession of bankruptcy. Describing the net result of the long labors of the Preparatory Commission, our chief representative, Ambassador Gibson, said at the closing session, "I should not be frank if I did not say that this draft falls far short of our hopes and expectations. It fails to contain many factors in which we have always believed and which in our opinion would lead to a real reduction in armaments. What we have achieved does not hold out the promise of bringing about that immediate reduction of armaments we would like to see. We can at least forsee a stabilization of armaments."

In a world which has pledged itself to disarmament with one hand and proceeded to increase its armaments with the other, there may be some slight gain in merely "stabilizing" armaments at the present high level. But in the present critical world situation such gain would be more theoretic than real. For stabilization would mean perpetuating the present inequality, in violation of

the Versailles Treaty—viz. the allied nations armed to the teeth while Germany is virtually disarmed. The one thing that is clear is that, unless general arms reduction is achieved soon, the German nation will insist on arming again. Speaking of the stern necessity for speedy action, the Greek delegate declared that "disarmament is imperatively necessary;" the Dutch chairman of the Commission said, "No more time is to be lost. The people await. Failure now would mean disaster;" the German delegate warned of "grave danger" unless action can be secured; and Ambassador Gibson warned against a false sense of security when he said, "Public opinion will not be informed in such a way as to exercise an intelligent influence if, through a desire to create confidence, we adopt too optimistic a tone as to what can be accomplished on the basis of our present draft."

Is it not clear that the supreme need of the world just now is not for new machinery, valuable and necessary as such machinery is, but rather, as John Dewey puts it, for "a new spirit, a new consciousness" on the part of Governments that leads to the realization that as nations we are all members one of another, and that we must act not for the ends of selfish aggrandizement but for the largest good of all nations?

Lord Cecil said: "This convention gives the people of the world a great opportunity. What will they do with it? The world can be disarmed if the people wish. The question is—do the people wish for disarmament? Only they can give the answer."

To quote from an editorial in the *New York Telegram*, "Faced with this explosive world situation, the United States during the year 1931 has the power to lead in international cooperation for peace without which the armament race, unchecked, will lead inevitably to war. If the United States will join the World Court promptly, keep down its own armament expenditures, call off its tariff war against other nations, come forward with a consultation treaty that will give meaning to the Kellogg Peace Pact outlawing war, we may prevent the international explosion. This is the World Challenge to the United States."

J. H. R.

THE ORGANIZATION AND METHODS OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

by

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

Former Member of the Court

IT IS not my purpose to make a controversial address,* but rather to give you an account of the World Court as a going concern. I shall make no apology for dealing with details of organization, as I have discovered that there is profound ignorance on this subject in the most unsuspected quarters. One of the world's famous statesmen, whom I met abroad last summer, asked me how the judges of the Court were elected, and from the sort of questions put to me in this country, even by lawyers, I am persuaded that, while there has been much discussion about the World Court, there is but little knowledge on the part of most people of the facts relating to its constitution and actual working. I trust that you will find the facts with respect to the organization of the Court interesting, and I shall take the liberty of adding a description of its methods in dealing with cases, giving you the impressions I have gained from my connection with it.

What is the World Court, or the Permanent Court of International Justice, as it is formally designated? It is a bench of fifteen judges, eleven ordinary judges and four deputy judges, the latter being called upon to serve in the absence of ordinary judges. Nine judges constitute a quorum, but it is intended that eleven shall sit if possible. Under the revision of the organization of the Court, which is now before the Government for approval, the position of deputy judges will be abolished

* An address delivered before the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, January 16, 1930, and reprinted by kind permission of Chief Justice Hughes.

and instead there will be fifteen ordinary judges. This will give opportunity for calling the judges to sit in rotation, so long as eleven are available, an arrangement which may be used to facilitate the work of the Court. The judges are elected for nine years and all are elected at the same time except as vacancies arise which are filled by special elections for the unexpired term. The next election will take place in September 1930, when the entire bench of fifteen judges will be chosen. When a State, or a country, as we say, which is a party to a case before the Court has none of its own nationals among the judges, that State may appoint a judge to sit in that particular case. In this way, there may be more than eleven judges sitting.

How Judges Are Elected

How are the judges elected? Manifestly, it is of vital importance to have competent and impartial men, and the method of selection deserves careful consideration. The Court is organized under a constitution which is called the "Statute" of the Court, and this is put into effect by agreement among the nations that support the Court. This argument is called the "Protocol of the Permanent Court of International Justice," and it has been signed by fifty-four States. The States in the Western Hemisphere that did not sign the original protocol of the Court are the United States, the Argentine Republic, Mexico, Ecuador and Honduras. In Europe, Turkey and Soviet Russia also did not sign.

Before the judges are elected, there must be nominations. For this purpose resort is had to the members of the old Court of Arbitration established under the Hague Convention of 1907, to which the United States is a party. That Court of Arbitration consists of members appointed by the various Governments and is really a panel of arbitrators from which selection can be made for particular arbitrations. We have in the United States, for example, four members of the old Court of Arbitration who have been designated by the President: Elihu Root, John Bassett Moore, Newton D. Baker and myself. These national groups, respectively, of members of the old Court of Arbitration make the nominations

of judges for the new World Court. The statute of the new Court recommends that each of these national groups should consult the highest court of their country, its legal faculties and associations devoted to the study of law, to the end that impartial and competent jurists should be proposed. After the nominations have been made, the election of judges of the World Court takes place in the Council and Assembly of the League of Nations. Let me say a word as to the reason for this method of selection. If you had fifty or more judges, representing fifty or more States, you might have an assemblage of an interesting character, but it would not be able to function properly as a court. It would resemble a parliamentary assembly with the maximum opportunities for delays, obstruction and the intrusion of politics. It would be practically impossible to maintain continuous, independent and satisfactory judicial work. But if you have a less number of judges, how are you to deal with the rivalries of Governments and obtain a court that will command the confidence of so many countries, both the great Powers and the smaller Powers? The organization of the League of Nations offered a method by which this difficulty could be solved. In the small body which constitutes the Council of the League the great Powers, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and now Germany, are permanent members. The choice of judges by the Council would thus naturally represent the wishes of the great Powers. In the Assembly of the League all the fifty or more Powers stand on an equal footing, and the small Powers are in a great majority. Hence, election by the Assembly means that the small Powers have had their say. To elect the judges, there must be a majority in each body, and the concurrent elections by both the Council and Assembly mean the concurrence of the Powers, both great and small. If the two bodies do not agree on a choice, a conference committee, like one of the conference committees of our Senate and House of Representatives, is appointed and, if an agreement is not reached in this way, the members of the World Court, already chosen, proceed to elect.

Guarantee of Justice to All

There is much talk in this country as to the election of judges by the League of Nations. It is quite evident, however, that if upwards of fifty States are to elect judges they must meet in some way for this purpose. If there were no League of Nations, and a World Court were set up, the Governments would have to arrange for an organization to elect judges. The League of Nations is frequently spoken of as though it were a unit, or acted as an entity in the election, but it is really composed of all these States, or countries, which have different policies and objectives and, when it comes to the selection of judges, they are not acting with the unity of a league but proceed according to their several conceptions of what the situation requires in the selection of a body of judges, who are not to execute orders but to pass upon the controversies which arise when States are unable to agree. The League of Nations provides an organization by which all these countries can make their choice. If the United States adheres to the protocol of the Court, it will be entitled to participate as a Great Power in the elections in both the Council and Assembly. It would naturally be expected that nationals (that is, citizens) of great States, in view of the magnitude of their interests, would always be found in the membership of an international court and thus that nationals of such countries as Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan would be selected. The same would be true of the United States if it supported the Court, as it has been true of the United States even in the absence of that support. There has always been a citizen of the United States on the World Court. Germany has no national on the Court at present, but it is most probable that she will have after the next election* of judges. If all these great Powers had nationals on the Court, this would account for six of the fifteen judges, and nine others would be nationals of other and smaller Powers. The conflict of interests, which there is

* Walter Schücking was elected on September 25th. On the same date Frank Kellogg, previously elected to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Charles Evans Hughes, was elected to the World Court for the full nine-year period.—Editor.

nothing in the organization of the League of Nations even to obscure, much less to destroy, naturally tends to bring about the selection of men who by reason of their age, their experience, their character and attainments enjoy the confidence of the large group of small Powers whose part in the election is essential. For whatever great Powers may do when they fall into controversy, resort to the Permanent Court is recognized as the most important guarantee of justice to the smaller Powers. Their interest in the selection of judges is therefore very keen. As the men proposed by the national groups of great Powers must submit themselves to the election by the smaller Powers, the great Powers naturally put forward men of eminence whose records they think will stand scrutiny; and as the judges proposed by the groups in the smaller Powers are to pass upon the controversies of the great Powers, they are prompted to offer men of the required competence. No institution in this world can escape human limitations. We have had difficulties at times with reference to the choice of men for the Supreme Court of the United States. If you reflect upon the selection of judges for a permanent international court, I am inclined to think that you will find that it would be difficult to suggest a method which in its general features would be more likely to secure a bench of international judges in which confidence could be reposed. If you sought to establish a world court independently of the League of Nations, the fifty or more States which are now members of the League would have to join in electing judges and it would be necessary to provide a practical plan by which you would have an organization of all the States concerned which would measurably correspond to the organization of the Council and Assembly of the League in order to insure the balance of the small and great Powers which is essential to the establishment of an effective tribunal. I think that the real point with some of our friends who oppose the present method of selection is not that the method itself is inherently defective, but that they are opposed to a permanent court altogether. But for many reasons, which I cannot undertake at this time to

detail, it has long been the desire and policy of the United States to have a permanent international court.

Similar considerations apply to the fixing and payment of the salaries of the judges and the expenses of the Court. The League provides the organization for this purpose, but it should be remembered that it is upwards of fifty countries composing the League and supporting the Court that fix the salaries and that these countries pay them together with the expenses of the Court according to their quotas. If there were no League, the salaries and expenses of a world court would have to be contributed by the supporting governments, and there would have to be machinery for making the budget apportionment and payment. What is really of importance is the fact that when judges have been elected, neither they nor their decisions are subject to the control of the League. A judge can be dismissed only when in the unanimous opinion of the other judges he has ceased to fulfill the required conditions. I should add that the ordinary judges, as distinguished from the deputy judges, are not permitted to exercise any political or administrative function during their term of office. The revision of the statute of the Court, which is now awaiting approval, not only contains this prohibition but also provides that the members of the Court may not engage in any other occupation of a professional nature.

Function of the World Court

What is the function of the World Court? It is to pass upon questions which arise between States. It does not take cognizance of controversies between individuals, or controversies between individuals and a State. A State may make the cause of its nationals its own, and thus present a controversy with another State, of which the Court has jurisdiction. This was illustrated in the cases decided at the last term of the Court between France and Brazil and France and Yugo-Slavia, in each of which the French Government had espoused the cause of the holders of bonds issued by the other Government.

Unless the States which support the Court have otherwise

agreed, resort to the Court is not compulsory; they retain the right to refuse to submit their cases to the Court. In the proposal that the United States should adhere to the protocol of the Court, it has not been suggested that the United States should accept a compulsory jurisdiction. If the United States adheres, it can still refuse to submit to the Court any particular controversy. The Court will not decide a dispute between States unless the parties to the dispute have consented to its submission to the Court.

Now there is a class of controversies which Governments ought always to be willing to submit to judicial settlement. These are controversies over what are essentially questions of law as distinguished from questions of mere policy. They are disputes concerning questions of international law, as to the interpretation of treaties, as to the existence of facts out of which international obligation arises, or as to the reparation that should be made when there has been a breach of an international obligation. Questions of this sort in all civilized countries are normally disposed of by judicial tribunals. It has been the declared policy of the United States that such questions should be submitted to arbitration, which is a form of judicial settlement. We have not taken the unreasonable position before the world that we would take the law into our own hands and that where we had a legal dispute with another country we should insist on deciding it for ourselves. The Pact of Paris, or the Kellogg pact, would be but a ridiculous form of words if the attitude of those who signed it were otherwise, for this agreement says not only that war is renounced as a national policy but that the settlement of disputes shall be had only by pacific means. Pacific means for the settlement of a legal controversy, if the parties cannot come to an agreement, is judicial settlement. In the class of questions I have just described, the statute of the Court provides that the States supporting it may, if they choose, sign what is called an optional clause accepting compulsory jurisdiction. A considerable number of States—I believe about forty-two—including Great Britain, France, Italy and Germany—

have signed this clause. A large number of these have not as yet ratified. Aside from this optional clause, there are a great number of special treaties between countries which provide for the submission of controversies to the World Court if the parties find themselves unable to agree.

Court Applies International Law

What law does the Court apply in the disposition of controversies? It applies international law. What is international law? It is the body of principles and rules which civilized States consider as binding upon them in their mutual relations. It rests upon the consent of sovereign States. There are many questions which are discussed by international jurists with respect to principles which are not yet embodied in international law as there is no satisfactory evidence of the consent of States to be bound by them. There are also particular principles and rules that are binding upon particular States because they are established by treaties between such States. These rules are not, properly speaking, international law, but they govern the States that have agreed to them. If there is a dispute as to a question of international law and the Court finds that there is no international law on the subject, it says so. It is not its function to create rules of international law. It explores, hears arguments and determines whether there is a rule of international law applicable to a given case. Its decisions on such questions expound and clarify international law. The law thus develops in a normal way by the unfolding of its accepted principles in their application to particular disputes. But the Court does not assume the function of a legislature. The Court is naturally very cautious in this part of its work; an international court would not long survive that took to itself the legislative function or the making of law for States. In the ascertainment of international law, the Court examines international custom as evidence of a general practice accepted as law, the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations, and also judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations.

It is often said that before an international court can properly function there should be law to apply. Of course, there is an existing body of international law. No intelligent person would deny that. What is meant is, that it is a limited body, and that it should be extended so as to provide adequately for the government of the relations of States to each other. That process is involved in what is called the codification of international law, a phrase used ambiguously, but generally taken to describe both a definitive statement of existing law and also desirable modifications in order to add to and improve the law. That progress should be made in the codification of international law is the earnest desire of jurists and all who seek to hasten and make secure the reign of law in place of force. The intelligent efforts now being made in this direction are among the most gratifying signs of our times and worthy of all praise and support. But it must be recognized that the process is an extremely slow one, for it depends not only upon the acquiescence of jurists in definitions and proposed changes, which is about as difficult to secure as a consensus of theologians, but also the final approval of governments which is almost impossible to obtain when the questions involved are of serious practical importance and the objectives of governments differ. Such statements and amendments of the law require the same acquiescence of the States composing the family of nations as that which underlies existing international law. It should also be observed that even where there is an accepted principle of law, it fares much better in the application of it to particular states of fact in controversies as they arise than in an attempted formulation of it in the endeavor to enact a rigid statute. That has been the experience in efforts at codification of domestic or municipal law and obviously the difficulty is far greater when you come to a rigid formulation of international concepts. When a court applies a principle, you may readily recognize it and appreciate its application although not entirely content with the linguistic expression of it in the judicial opinion.

Neither the desirability nor the difficulty of codifying inter-

national law furnishes any reason for delay in establishing or supporting a permanent international court. You would still have to arrange for the pacific settlement of international disputes. You could not decide them for yourselves. If you gave the decision to arbitrators in sporadic arbitrations, you would have the same difficulty, and, in my judgment, a much less satisfactory judicial tribunal than a permanent court such as the World Court. If you were to wait for an international court until you could get a satisfactory body of international law, the only time that such a court could function would be in the millennium and most people may doubt whether at such a time it would be necessary.

(To be concluded)

ELEMENTS OF A WORLD CULTURE

III. Education

by

H. A. Overstreet

Department of Philosophy, The College of the City of New York

I

We are asked to think of education as a factor in world understanding. I suppose the first thought that comes to one is that education must inevitably be the really great factor in producing such understanding. May I question that assumption? Education has become for us a kind of ever-ready cure-all. Whenever there is any long continued social difficulty, we hear people say: "Education will solve the problem." It is a kind of accepted "patter," a curiously unfortunate kind because it serves constantly to cloud the issue.

The fact, of course, is that there are many different kinds of education. There can be an education for thievery—subtle or crude. There can be an education which makes snobs of people—we have it in many of our finishing schools. There can be an education which makes a whole people feel itself superior to all other peoples. And also there can be an education which deepens comprehension and broadens outlook. In short, there can be good education and also bad education. Therefore to assert that education is going to make us world-minded is meaningless.

As a matter of fact, when one looks upon the average types of education, I think one must agree that, however much they have succeeded along certain lines, nevertheless in the matter of developing individuals trained to world-understanding, they have been rather disappointing failures. Why has this been so? The reason, I suspect, is that the traditional forms of education have been quite definitely limited in their objectives.

Such education has aimed, first and foremost, at the individual's survival among his fellows. This, to be sure, has been wholly necessary, and when we say what follows we are casting no aspersions but simply noting a fact. What does the child study in the schools? Reading, writing, and arithmetic—the so-called "tool" subjects. Why? To make the child a finer individual? To develop his mind so that it will reach out over the world of men? He is taught reading, writing, and arithmetic in order that he may fit into a world where reading, writing, and figuring are indispensable. There are doubtless psychological effects which are by-products of these "tool" subjects—a certain orderliness and discipline of mind, a possibility of entrance into more or less fascinating realms of reading—but primarily, the "tool" subjects serve the quite necessary function of providing the individual with the indispensable means for survival.

Let us pass now from "tool" subjects to subjects like history and literature. What object do they serve? The answer, I think, is that where the "tool" subjects serve the purpose of individual survival, the cultural subjects chiefly serve the purpose of group survival. We sometimes hear it said that the aim of education is to make fine citizens. This, in other words, means that the aim is to develop individuals who will fit frictionlessly into the cultural scheme. If we examine the history and literature that are taught, we find, in practically all cases, that they support the cultural scheme in which the child finds himself.

What this cultural scheme is can be noted by recalling the three concepts which prevail, concepts which set the pattern for the child's thought and behavior. There is, first of all, the concept of localism. Practically all of the literature and history that has been available for teaching purposes has had the localistic note, the idea, namely, that humanity is inevitably divided into politically separated groups and that loyalty to one's group is the highest social virtue. We find it even in a philosopher like Plato. He wrote the ideal "Republic," not on the pattern of a world-state, but of a little city with its inclosing walls and defending army.

The second pattern-idea that has prevailed has been the military one. This has followed logically from the localistic concept. In practically all literature and history that is available for use in the schools, it is taken for granted that groups will inevitably be at odds with one another and that the fundamental relationship between groups is that of potential or actual enemies who seek to control one another by force. I need hardly refer to the manner in which the military concept has been invested with such glamor as to make the virtue of martial heroism very nearly the high water mark of the humanly desirable.

The third concept is a little difficult to describe. Let me first illustrate it. The child, let us say, reads a book of adventure. An explorer is killing a savage beast. The obvious feeling engendered in the child is one of pleasure in personal courage. And that, indeed, as far as it goes, is all to the good. Or the child reads a romance in which an admirable young man has fallen in love with an equally admirable young woman. In this case, the obvious feeling engendered is one of pleasure in personal love. And that, too, as far as it goes, is all to the good. Personal courage against a particular foe and personal love for a personal beloved—these, perhaps, are the fine flower of what our children gather from literature.

But the adventure practically never goes beyond this meeting of specific dangers, the romance never beyond this absorption in a single beloved. It is not that this is bad. It is rather that it is not enough. For one can easily see that in such reading there is nothing that broadens the child's mind into a courage that faces the monsters that rear themselves against the world-weal—monsters like racial animosity, prejudice, mob-mindedness, social and political ignorance, war—nor into a love that embraces those of different race and class. As a matter of fact, children brought up on such literature of adventure and romance may, in the wider matters of human concern, remain as pathetically narrow, localistic, and even military minded as those who are without the advantage of such education.

How effectively, then, can a system of education make

for world-mindedness which emphasizes, on the one hand, the tool subjects for personal survival, and, on the other, localism, militarism, and a too narrowly restricted individualism? There have, of course, been minds that placed a different emphasis upon things and pointed the way to a more adequate culture. There was Kant, for example, with his Essay on Perpetual Peace; but Kant is hardly usable in the school room. And there was Spinoza, with his view of life that transcended the narrow bounds of sect and nation; but Spinoza, also, could hardly find his way into school textbooks. Above all, there was the Nazarine, with his universal viewpoint—of man as man, not as an American nor as a German, but as a son of God. But the Nazarine is not permitted, in the schools, to go counter to the strong cultural heritages of group aggressiveness and competitive individualism. He belongs to a "Sunday" school which fails to pass over into the Mondays and Tuesdays of secular education.

If the foregoing is true, it is clear what education, as we know it, actually does. American education is interested, primarily, in the perpetuation of American culture; it is not interested in exploring and perhaps adopting Hindu culture, in part or in whole, nor Soviet culture. Nor is it interested in a culture more adequate than any yet realized. It accepts American culture, and it takes it for granted that children are to be fitted into it snugly and frictionlessly.

It is therefore not difficult to see why education has, in large measure, been a failure so far as the development of a more universalized mind is concerned. Education has deliberately aimed at perpetuating a view of life that, in essentials, is either indifferent to or goes counter to world-understanding and world-organization. If we see this, we shall cease believing that when we place students in a classroom they will inevitably become world-minded. Unfortunately, they can remain just as narrow, localistic, and military minded as ever. It would be well if those devoted to world ideals, and counted so much on "education" to realize them, would keep these facts in mind.

II

What, now, can we do about the matter? The first bit of wisdom, I take it, is to realize that the things we do in our schools, good as far as they go, do not yet go far enough to build up the kind of mind so greatly required by our modern age. How are we now to take the further steps which will develop that type of mind?

We must, of course, begin with the teachers. As often as not, the teacher, trained under a system which has laid stress on the ideas and objectives above mentioned, has, in his or her own attitude, been a hindrance to the development of generous, outreaching, challenging attitudes on the part of the students. Teachers, for the most part, have served as effective exponents of the *status quo*. There has been something in their training that has done this; something, too, in the authoritarian nature of the system in which they work; something, also, in the relation expected of them to their community.

As to their teacher-training, it has centered chiefly upon methods of teaching. It has been in very small measure occupied with the fundamental philosophy of the world in which they live and are expected to work. Occupied with the best ways of teaching arithmetic, grammar, history, and the rest, prospective teachers have had their eyes turned away from the very real perplexities and maladjustments of the social, political, and industrial world. Inevitably their later teaching reflects their lack of concern with life as, in so great a measure, a difficult and fumbling effort to advance itself towards something more satisfyingly human.

What is deeply needed, then, is the development of teachers who are evolutional minded. "The American college," writes President Morgan of Antioch—and the same might be said of the elementary schools—"should not merely sum up the prevailing culture and transmit it to the next generation. It should critically examine our civilization and contribute to its re-design and refinement. Our modern life halts in its progress, not only

from inability to see clearly, but from a palsy of will and purpose and a lack of the spirit of adventure which leads men to undertake significant changes in the social order."

A teacher with a challenging mind would inevitably produce students with challenging minds. But now we come to a second factor which stands in the way of the development of such minds. The schools are built on a pattern which discourages independence of mind and encourages passive agreement. The teacher is hired by a system. It is an authoritarian one. There are certain facts to be taught. These are rigidly prescribed. There is a monarch who surveys all that is taught, whose word is law and whose displeasure spells failure. And above the monarch is a super-monarch—a Board—whose word is the ultimate in authority. Schools, for the most part, are not delightful places where the teachers are a self-governing group of exploring minds trained to work in mutuality of spirit and in the expectation that they themselves are to generate, out of their own discussion and research, what is to be of value in the classroom. They are regimented to do a job, and the job is prescribed by rules.

The result is that all over the land the teacher is notoriously timid in all matters that go beyond the mere methodology of teaching. He, or she, fitting into the authoritarian system, is a mind acceptive of the accepted things. And he, or she, carries on the same old process of ushering acceptive minds into a world that, above all, needs minds with the power of discriminating challenge.

"Higher education," continues President Morgan—and again the same may be applied to the more elementary schools—"should be critical of remedies as well as of diseases—should lay sound foundations of knowledge and experience as a basis for social policies. When judgment is based upon sound scholarship and broad representative experience, it becomes a reasonably safe guide to vigorous action." Radicalism has a bad name because radicalism is so frequently without a sound basis of critical judgment. But it is not radicalism that is to blame for this but an educational system which, turning its face away from the con-

troversial issues of social life, gives to young minds no training in critical social judgment. "Mother may I go out to swim?" cried a world seeking new ways of bettering its life. "Yes, my darling daughter," said the schools. "Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, but don't go near the water."

Then there is a third hindrance. We are proud of the fact—and rightly so—that education is deeply and integrally a community project. But when we find that the community, having done its best to secure trained minds in whose care to place their children, listens in on the schoolroom teaching—whether in the person of Chamber of Commerce, military legions, or sons and daughters of this, that and the other—and dictates what shall and what shall not be said and done, we have a situation that is educationally intolerable. It is as if the patient should say to the physician: "Cure me, but cure me according to *my* directions." That, of course, is what happens when local bodies, jealous, in their way, for the national or local weal, place their ban upon what the trained minds may happen to teach. Nothing deeply reconstructive and critically progressive can take place in the schools and colleges until the public is educated to a policy of "hands off." By this I do not, of course, mean indifference. I mean a generous willingness to trust the critical minds they have chosen in the fields in which they have had their fundamental training.

Evolutional minded teachers, teachers with critically challenging minds, a school system democratic in spirit and organized for creative self-government, a public willing to keep interfering hands off—these, it seems to me, are indispensable prerequisites if we are to advance to a type of education that even begins to generate world-understanding.

III

Given such teachers and such a school system, one might go far towards doing many things which now are not done. For example, there could be the tacit agreement that whatever was studied would, in some manner, be studied in its world

context. History, of course, would lend itself immediately to such manner of treatment. To inquire, while one was reading of the great days of Pericles, what was happening in China, India, Russia, and the far-off British Isles, what was happening in Mexico and Peru, would give the youth a vivid sense of the variety and the unity of the world process, would lead him to think always in terms that went beyond the particular locality and embraced the whole of mankind. What is deeply needed, of course, is to generate a new kind of emotion in people. Nations have been able to develop a strong emotion of love and admiration through a study of their own particular struggles towards secure nationhood. We need now to pass to the next stage, to generate a thrill of admiration and love for the fumbling, half conscious effort of man everywhere to push life forward towards something finer. To have the student read history as the record of man's long struggle to win his emancipation from the lower and the inadequate is to help him to a new kind of affection for the mankind of which he and his nation are part.

Literature likewise lends itself to this universalizing treatment. Is it folk tales that the child is reading? It would be illuminating to have him discover how the same tale gets itself repeated all over the world. Is it a tale of heroism? He would find variations of the same thing among most of the peoples of the world. Is it romance? It would be a significant thing for him to learn when the finer forms of romance began to make their appearance among men and how widely they penetrate among the peoples of the world. Through such a study the student would unconsciously develop the habit of thinking of mankind as essentially one in nature despite obvious differences of custom and organization.

Science, too, can be studied in its world context. The generous relations of scientists to one another, the carrying of the best that their minds have to offer across the boundaries of their local groups, the fine intelligence of man that has placed no customs ban on the thoughts of the truth seekers, the widespread influence of scientific discoveries, the interknitting of peoples into

a world community of scientific give-and-take—all these things, made vivid, should go far to liberate the students from narrow sectionalism and place them at the point of view of world cooperation in the search for understanding and control.

Thus we stretch the minds of our students, give them wider areas in which to think, open up to them the fascinating bigness of the whole human enterprise.

Again, with such teachers and such a system as we have described, there will inevitably be, in all the studies, an attitude of pointing forward. These things—the fine flower of literature, the achievements of science, the struggles for liberty and order—are indeed great. But what can we now conceive as the still greater that is to come? There is not a single study in which this forward looking attitude cannot be in evidence. It requires only on the part of the teacher a vivid interest in the world as, in all its phases, an ongoing enterprise.

Finally, the essential wish of such teachers and of such a system will be to foster whatever is finely creative in the students. There will be little interest in a mere passive fulfillment on the part of students of duties assigned. Discipline of mind and spirit will, indeed, be sought, but it will be sought as the outcome of personalities awakened into vital interest and participation. The essential effort will be to stimulate independent thought and creative initiative, for it will be realized that the mind is more than a machine that dutifully stamps out what it is set to do. The human mind is itself the builder and director of machines and gains its dignity as it learns with fineness and surety of vision to create anew.

> "Verily it doth lift up
> Matter like a sacred cup."

This is a new spirit that is beginning to find its way even into the tradition-bound forms of our education. Not to impose patterns, but to train the builders of new patterns, not to adhere to the old standards, but to inspire students to find standards more adequate to human understanding—it is something of this sort that will animate the teachers of a more fortunate generation.

IV

And now, finally, a matter that has been most sadly neglected of all. Education, we have supposed, was for children. Or at most it was for youths and maidens. Even here, however, our ideas have been slowly changing, for gradually we have prolonged the years of childhood until, through high school and college, those years have advanced almost to maturity. And yet maturity is still neglected. It is a rare adult who deliberately goes on with his education. But also, it is a rare community that gives him the opportunity to go on with the cultivation of his mind.

There has been the curious assumption that everything which needed to be learned could be learned in childhood and youth. This, of course, is altogether untrue, for most of the problems that we have to confront in adult life—problems of household, politics, industry, child rearing, sex life—can have no intelligent place in the early years. That, no doubt, is why adults continue to make so sorry a mess of things in the world. They have never learned to think through the matters that are to be their chief concern.

The next great insight of mankind will unquestionably be that adulthood is just as deeply in need of education as childhood and youth, and that a community which makes no adequate provision for such education is simply working for its own stultification. It is the adult who faces most seriously the problems of human relations in a world of work and exchange, of competition and co-operation, of love and child-rearing. It is the adult who needs to know seriously what the whole human enterprise is about, what are the ways that lead to failure and what are the ways that lead to a fine human triumph. Nothing very far reaching can happen in the way of world understanding or even of personal or group understanding until our civilization deliberately sets itself to the education of the adults.

THE INTERNATIONAL NOTE IN THE NOVELS OF THE PRE-WAR YEARS

by

A. Evelyn Newman

Professor of English Literature, State Teachers College, Greeley, Colorado

(Concluded)

H. G. Wells in *A World Set Free*, published in May 1914, foretells the World War as occurring in 1958 between the Central Powers and the Slav Confederacy. France and Great Britain are dragged in. The old-fashioned infantry, cavalry, and artillery are banished for the use of atomic bombs which, once started, go on exploding till the end of time. The great cities become furnaces. Holland's dykes are burst to destroy the flames. The world is forced to unite. There is a gathering of representatives from all countries near Brissago, Switzerland. A young king, Egbert by name, is the first to renounce his crown. All existing monarchs follow his example. A World State is formed. Atomic energy is used for constructive purposes instead of for war. Marcus Karenin, the teacher, gives out ideas of world progress much as did the school teacher in Zola's Vérité, much as at a later date, Job Huss was to do in *The Undying Fire*, a novel of Wells' post-war work.

Anatole France describes plans for a war between earth and heaven in *La Révolte des Anges*. It was also published in 1914. M. France has little but gloomy thought in it upon the future of terrestrial or celestial beings. His philosophy concerning war as a means of victory or gain of any sort is expressed in the words of Prince Istar to the angels in revolt:

"What is war? A burlesque masquerade in the midst of which fatuous patriots sing their stupid dithyrambs . . . you

are visionaries. When will you become thinkers? . . . They do not believe in war, which is a phantasy; they believe in chemistry, which is a science." (P. 257.)

The plans for war grow. The rebels wish Satan to be their head. He refuses, saying:

"Comrades,—we will not conquer the heavens. . . . War engenders war, and victory defeat. . . . We were conquered because we failed to understand that Victory is a Spirit, and that it is in ourselves . . . alone, that we must attack and destroy Ialdabaoth." [1]

From such black and empty pessimism, it is a relief to turn to the spiritual force that is Romain Rolland and trace his pre-war philosophy concerning war and international understanding as given in that most powerful expression of it since Tolstoi's *War and Peace*—*Jean Christophe*. In this vast study of European temperaments, of contrast and delineation of French and German, especially in the characters of Jean and Olivier, in the Pilgrim Chorus of the spirit that surges up like a great harmony to bear the reader to higher ground for thought, we hear the challenge that nothing can destroy the soul but its own baseness, that force is necessary, but mental and spiritual force rather than physical. The wild spirit of Jean is disciplined through immense effort, through failure and isolation, through friendship and suffering, until he realizes that the only power is the power of the spirit. Olivier represents that power and tells him that even though he loves his country he would not use physical force, would not fight to kill, in order to protect it. The friendship of these two men is symbolic of the possible friendship that might come between Germany and France. Romain Rolland reflects the complex currents of thought of his time, the conflict between countries, generations, points of view. Like Bergson, he realizes that all things change, yet like him he sees a central unity of ideal. Struggle goes on eternally. M. Rolland saw the approaching war, but he did not abandon all hope. If a bloody

[1] *The Revolt of the Angels*, transl. by Mrs. Wilfrid Jackson. (John Lane, The Bodley Head, Ltd., London, pp. 356–357.)

death were to fall upon Europe, there must come a resurrection in the future. In the last volume of *Jean Christophe*, published in 1912, he foretells the events of 1914–18:

"The fire smouldering in the forest of Europe was beginning to burst into flames. In vain did they try to put it out in one place: it only broke out in another. With gusts of smoke and showers of sparks it swept from one point to another, burning the dry brushwood . . . All men were possessed by the desire for battle. War was ever on the point of breaking out. . . . The world felt that it was at the mercy of an accident that might let loose the dogs of war. . . . This, then, was to be the end of the physical and moral resurrection of the races of the West! To such butchery they were to be borne along . . . nowhere in Europe was there any genius for action. It was as though the world had chosen the most mediocre to be its governors. The force of the human mind was in other things—so there was nothing to be done but to trust to the declivity down which they were moving. This both governors and governed were doing. Europe looked like a vast armed vigil."[2]

The German novelists most comparable to Anatole France and Romain Rolland, to Galsworthy and Wells in point of age and achievement, are the brothers Heinrich and Thomas Mann (born 1871 and 1875). Their philosophy is European rather than national, their culture is of the world, and their political faith is toward the United Republican Europe of social and intellectual freedom as opposed to the iron rule of militarism and the machine developments of industrialism.

Heinrich Mann's trilogy, *Das Kaiserrich: Der Untertan* (1914–1918) *Die Armen* (1917) *Der Kopf* (1925) and his most recent novel *Eugénie* (1929) illustrate all these aims. In a different but equally powerful manner does Thomas Mann's *Der Zauberberg* (1924) give constructive criticism of the old and preparation for the new society. These novels by the brothers Mann, the *Research Magnificent* (1915) by H. G. Wells and *Der Tolle Professor* (1928) by Sudermann, may be classified as dealing with the transition

[2] *Jean Christophe*, Vol. X (1912). English translation of Gilbert Cannon, Vol. IV, p. 504.

period between Europe nominally at peace and Europe in the early war days.

Though last in date of publication, Sudermann's book comes first in date of period considered, that of Bismarck and his relentless war against liberalism, his indomitable will to create a Germany impregnable from a military and industrial standpoint. Sudermann describes, in the person of Professor Sieburth, the tragic fate of all who differed from this policy of blood and iron. The period after the war of 1870–71 was transitional also. The younger generation saw no ideal and was crushed by the autocratic system for which William the Second's Germany was to become famous. In such an atmosphere, the University of Königsberg could not preserve a free spirit. Professor Sieburth, newly elected to the honoured Chair of Kant, had wasted, through dissipation, much of his spiritual energy for resistance and courage to fight for intellectual freedom. He shoots himself at the end. The university and social life is depicted as lacking in idealism and morality. The description of the conduct in the fraternities, in the political groups of the faculty, in the night-clubs of the town, is an appalling one and is only to be compared with that made by Frank Thiess in *Der Leibhaftige* (1924), a novel presenting post-war conditions.

While there are scenes of power in *Der Tolle Professor* and the sweep of a whole period, the detailed description of the sexual dissipation of the hero and the sentimental atmosphere surrounding his suicide weaken the chaotic whole. Only because it treats of the period which is the same as that of Heinrich Mann's *Eugénie* is it touched upon in this study. This novel derives its title from that of a play, *Eugénie*, which the Chauvinistic poet Heines is writing for the leading social group of the town. The time of the book is soon after the Franco-Prussian War. Consul West is the first citizen. Gabrielle, his wife, is of French extraction but seemingly in sympathy with the spirit and aim of her adopted country. At a dinner in the home of the West's, we hear a discussion of the recent war. The poet Heines delivers a fiery speech on the fatherland. In it he declares that

he, too, has borne the sword, "the sword of the word. What was the victory if not the fruit and the blessing of the belief of our people." He had spread this belief. "If it had not been that thought fought for us, where should we be?"

There are intrigues and flirtations between military officers and Gabrielle. The chief financial power of the town is Pidohm, an unsound speculator whose methods of business will not stand investigation from any standpoint of ethics. Professor von Heines poses always. "He sends forth like Zeus from under his white eyebrows haughty lightning." Yet the author shows us that the man knows he is not real, "for him himself everything went its way as appearance only." He can never be anything but a pretension. He praises all things old but lives in the newest house in the town. His interest in Pidohn's shady business activities is deep. The criticism of military code is implied in the description of a duel between two lieutenants who were great friends and had no wish to attack each other, yet were forced to do so through an inadvertent argument before witnesses. It was over some slight affair connected with Gabrielle. The duel resulted in only a slight wound for one of them. The whole book works up to a climax which is the production of the play *Eugénie*. While it is going on, there is conversation about the war among some of the young men of good family, officers in the Reserve:

"You must not think either, that we won always according to plan. Everything was often upside down with us, I can bear witness to that. It was mere chance that it ended well, and if it was not chance, then it was our preponderating strength."

This criticism might refer to any side in any war, Heinrich Mann seems to infer. His purpose would appear to be to destroy the idea of heaven-born leadership or extraordinary efficiency on any side. Just as Tolstoi and Hardy present Napoleon as scarcely more than a puppet of Destiny in the battles described in *War and Peace* and *The Dynasts*, so Mann would present as puppets or instruments of chance the military commanders of the war of 1870–71, and perhaps, of any war.

As the play progresses, an Order comes for the arrest of

Pidohn who was taking the part of Napoleon III. The curtain falls amid an uproar of excitement. Consul West is ruined by Pidohn's fall, having been involved in the unsound investments. Burgomeister Reuter comes to West's aid, telling him that he does so because back in about 1600, one of West's forefathers had saved Reuter's ancestors from a like catastrophe. This incident closes the book in which Herr Mann would seem to tell us that we are all very much the same in any phase of history or time. The conditions during the war of 1870–71 and after it were not unlike those of the World War and the post-war period, save in the increased perplexity and vastness of the horror and the resultant confusion in all ranks of society for the later period. The shallow flirtation of women of high society represented by Gabrielle, the dishonesty of certain types of business, as seen in Pidohn, the Chauvinistic posing of the Professor von Heines, the autocratic military system with its empty forms and ceremonies were all causes, ever widening and deepening, for Germany's part in the World War.

While *Eugénie* is perhaps more unified in structure and more artistic in its symbolism of all of life as a play than is *Das Kaiserreich*, it is in this trilogy that one finds the most comprehensive portrayal of the life of pre-war Germany. Mann reacts with Swiftian satire against the excesses and stupidity of the social, educational, business, and military system of the Germany of the last quarter of the century.

The first of the series, *Der Untertan*, was ready for publication at the beginning of July, 1914. Diederich Hessling, "the Subject," had a father of the stern disciplinarian type, a war veteran and a leading manufacturer of the small town in which he lives. Diederich is shy and timid. He is sent to the University of Berlin and through his father's influence becomes a member of a drinking and duelling student club. Through this membership, he gains more notice, and finally finds himself a person of authority. He becomes one with the system, grovels to all above him, bullies all who are beneath him in social or financial status. During his military service he finds the well-ordered

machine excellent for everyone but himself. He contrives to effect his discharge through malingering, but never falters in lip service to the Kaiser and the army. His indignation and hatred of all labor organizations and critics of existing conditions found frequent spoken and written utterance. "The foes from within were not to be endured." He obtains his doctorate and after many shady experiences with women, marries a rich one and becomes heir of his father's paper business in his native town, which is a replica of that presented in *Eugénie*. The contrast to Diederich in ideals and philosophy is given in the characters of Old Buch, one of the survivors of the 1848 liberalism, and his son Young Buch. Old Buch is opposed to the spirit that has arisen in Germany since the Franco-Prussian War. He sees the men of the village as having no individual manhood, they are merely the Kaiser's party-men—Pastor, Jew, Soldier, Financier—for one reason or the other, merely echo the voice from above.

Diederich is the spokesman of Might makes Right.—"Blood and Iron are still the best cure." Young Buch contends:

"The only real might today is Peace! Do you play the comedy of Force. Brag against imaginary foes outside and within! Luckily deeds are not allowed you!" "Not allowed? Diederich puffed as if fire was to come."

About their marriage Diederich says to his wife: "This business has the high object; that we do honor his Majesty and give him good soldiers." He rushes off to Rome for the honeymoon because the Kaiser happens to be going to Rome. The most beautiful happening of the journey is the appearance of his picture on the same page of the newspaper with that of the Kaiser—"the Kaiser together with his subject (Untertan) offered for the admiration of the world! With moist eyes Diederich drew himself up and sang Die Wacht am Rhein."

Diederich becomes a "gross Industrieller" through financial juggling. He overwhelms the Kaiser with telegrams as chairman of "Kaiser's Party," "Employers' Union" or "Soldiers' Union," in which he implores legal measures for military protection of

the authorities. He goes to church because "it is what those above wish." He holds that "against England we need a strong fleet; she must undoubtedly be smashed, she is the worst foe of the Kaiser. . . . Besides from England came certain fine kinds of paper whose import would be stopped most surely by a victorious war . . . 'As I hate England so only did Frederich the Great hate this nation of thieves and traitors!—That is a saying of his Majesty and I subscribe to it."

He subscribed to every word in every speech of the Kaiser. He liked to linger over threatened catastrophes, for "the German's soul is earnest, almost tragic, he declared."

The book closes with the unveiling of the statue to the Kaiser's grandfather William the Great. Diederich is the chief orator. Herr Mann portrays him as unknowingly describing the empire of Napoleon the Third in terms which are applicable to his own country and to his Kaiser:

"Abroad thinking only of prestige, at home only of police, with no belief but force, nothing else was sought but theatrical effect. There was only a boastful show made with the bygone heroic age, and the only heights really reached were those of Chauvinism . . . With all that we have nothing to do! Diederich shouted: . . . , therefore, with us it can never take that ending in horror which was reserved for the empire of our hereditary foe!"

Here a thunderstorm breaks up the gathering, but not before Diederich is presented with a ribbon of merit, an order of honor from the Kaiser.

Die Armen, published 1917, continues the story of the *Untertan*. Diederich Hessling is now the important manufacturer, but there is much discussion in the workmen's barracks of his nefarious methods. The great-uncle of one of the workers had been defrauded by Hessling's father of his share of the money in the original investments. This old man incites his nephew Balrich to efforts toward obtaining some of the rightful share in the business. Young Buch carries on the liberal teaching of his dead father. He has married Diederich's sister. Professor

Klinkorum is arrested as an accomplice to Balrich's alleged blackmailing of Hessling. He cries out in despair like Sudermann's Professor: "A fool I am, a plaything of the rich. I, the Intellectual!"

The whole condition of affairs is explained by Young Buch when speaking of the powerful net in which the community finds itself caught: "Earlier men got free of it at times, and future ones will. We of today do not. We yield!"

The Great War comes. Hessling had long had it on his mind. He had installed the new machines in good time for munitions making. He posed as a beneficent employer in giving three-fourths of the wages of his soldier-workmen to their families, but he really was making a huge fortune out of war munitions. Young Balrich when going to the front says to his wife: "All will be better when I come back again."

"She replies with the anguish of the whole of life in her face and no consolation in her voice: '*If* you come back!'"

So closes the book.

Der Kopf, the last of the trilogy (1925) treats of the pre-war governing classes in Berlin and has no connection in story, with the preceding two books. The two main characters, Mangolf and Terra, are young men determined to get on as social and financial climbers. Mangolf goes to the University of Munich. Terra becomes a member of a general agency—a business for boosting all of life—of finance, society, art, every form of endeavor. There is the same conflict of points of view: the supporters of militarism and exploitation on the one hand, and the advocates of a liberal democratic government on the other. The first section sneers at all social reform groups and shouts its praise of the Kaiser at political drinking and army clubs. For them the Kaiser is well-nigh omnipotent, as the author satirically describes their thought: "The Kaiser drew himself up, he looked in the glass. Behind him and his red uniform stood God! 'Genius! Personality!' they murmured."

The other group cried in answer: "A blood-baptised generation like ours had to come, so as, having knowledge from youth

up, to bring the world peace. The solution of the social problems is everlasting peace."

Terra's participations in the Boosters' organization are ended by the Director's suicide. Mangolf, now Doctor Mangolf, has worked his way to a private secretaryship in the Foreign Office. The power of the great manufacturers in the iron and steel industries and especially their influence upon the Kaiser is shown in symbolic episodes. Terra is now a Reichstag member.

The "Tangier incident," causing trouble in Morocco between France and Germany at the time, is suggested as possible reason for a secret journey made by Terra to Paris. The cause of this visit is not defined. But the Frenchman, he sees, says at parting: " 'The difference between our countries is only one of temperament. In other ways we are both walking the path of suffering.' . . .

"Which never ends, says Terra.

"On which we must support one another, adds the Frenchman.

"Then they gave their hands to one another, both hands" (p. 520).

When the Great War comes, Mangolf has become Chancellor of the Reich. The last scene in the book describes Terra and Mangolf together looking out upon departing soldiers. Military music is heard in the distance. Both friends are hopeless concerning war and the future. They see no outlet save death:

"Poor men!" shouted Mangolf. "They—for what do they die? For a hundred years more they will believe every man who speaks to them of their duty and greatness, and only wants their money."

"Much longer still for they have the undying passion of sacrificing themselves." said Terra.

Then they shoot themselves and fall over one another, "making a cross." "Outside the military music crashed, but of all that went by, Mangolf and Terra knew nothing—the pride, misery, wild faces."

Heinrich Mann's trilogy, *Das Kaiserreich*, presenting, as it

does, the material and spiritual ruin of pre-war and war Germany, constitutes in scope and power one of the severest indictments of extreme militarism and nationalism to be found in the field of contemporary literature. And this indictment is made by a mature writer of well-established fame in pre-war twentieth century German letters. Herr Mann in method of writing is the link between the naturalistic impressionistic realism of the pre-war fiction and the expressionistic realism of much of the war and post-war material of German writers. His technique shows the influence of the moving picture; his novels are series of episodes, of spectacular, scenic effects written with explosive satiric vehemence. He presents his scene, letting the actors play or rather speak their parts in such a way that the reader sees their pompousness and mediocrity. It is as though we were in a tower, looking down with detached calm upon the puppet show of absurdity and pretension. Heinrich Mann's own philosophy is given by such characters as Old Buch, Young Buch and Mangolf. His other characters are types of sick Germany.

Thomas Mann, the younger brother and the Nobel prize winner for 1929, treats of more than sick Germany in *Der Zauberberg*. The whole of Europe comes under his medical diagnosis. He is symbolic and ironic, like his brother, with a more subjective method. He, too, is a "revolutionnaire"[3] of the spirit, but he does not "attack the mighty in their material strongholds." Rather he studies sick civilization as it presents itself in an international sanatorium, where all that money and technical knowledge can contribute is offered with beauty of scenery and magic power of altitude to the cure of tuberculosis. We must not push too far a comparison of the diseased condition of these Germans, Russians, Italians, Dutchmen and people of other nationalities with that of pre-war Europe. But undoubtedly a comparison is implied. The scope of this study scarcely permits dwelling upon the masterly analysis of influence of habits and atmosphere upon the inmates of this sanatorium, of the fads and dissipations springing from the monotony and aimlessness of

[3] During the War, however, both he and Hauptmann were strongly Nationalistic.

invalid life, of the disease's heightening to almost super-intelligence of the creative thought of exceptional minds like those of Settembrini the humanist, Naptha the Jesuit, and, in a sense, young Hans Castorp, the Hamburg business man-to-be—who comes up for a three weeks' visit to his sick cousin, and stays seven years, long after his cousin's death, long after his own recovery. At first he stays because of a passion for a woman patient there, later through sheer inertia, power of habit. His mind and spirit had become accustomed to certain grooves of thought and friendships. He stays, gaining a clearer vision and a deeper insight into world problems through association with the powerful minds of Settembrini, Naptha, Peeperkorn.

Ludovico Settembrini, the Italian, believes in a great universal world republic. "Capitalistic Europe is willing her own fate—that of a destroying war. Human reason need only will more strongly than fate to become fate" (p. 422, Vol. 2). He has hope for the future. Of Hans Castorp, our hero, he asks: "You see through the space of countless ages life developing from infusorium to man: how can you doubt then that life has before him endless possibilities of development?"

The soldier's point of view is given by Joachim Ziemssen, Hans' cousin, who is in military life: "You find that when people discuss and express their views, nothing ever comes of it but confusion worse confounded. I tell you it doesn't matter in the least what a man's views are, so long as he is a decent chap. The best thing is to have no opinions and just do one's duty."

Hans replies: "You say that because you are a soldier, and your existence is purely formal."

The irony of many of the international enthusiasms is given in Settembrini's preaching of an international world republic: "Yet demanding rectification of the Brenner frontier to Italy even by fighting a war for what he calls civilization." Naptha, the Jesuit, contended that "every national state was of the Devil, yet justified national instincts." His denunciations have often a piercing power:

"A world republic is only the cry of a patient who constantly changes his position, thinking a new one will bring relief. The unconfessed but secretly quite general desire for war was another manifestation of the same condition. It would come, this war, and it would be a good thing, though the consequences of it would not be those anticipated by its authors. The flabby humanitarism went hand-in-hand with wolfish cruelty and baseness of the economic conflict within the bourgeois state. War! War! For his part he was for it. The general hankering seemed to him comparatively creditable."

And War did come, but not until Naptha, Peeperkorn and Hans Castorp's soldier cousin Joachim were dead, Settembrini on his death-bed, and Hans himself a confirmed habitué of the sanatorium, seemingly for life. With the declaration of war, Hans awoke from his spirit's dream, packed up and left for Hamburg and enlisted in the German army. Settembrini's farewell sounded his belief in the future development of democracy—"the day of the people was only biding its time." As Settembrini kisses Hans farewell, he remarks: "You, not your cousin! What tricks life plays!"

Thomas Mann expresses his own philosophy at the close of the book in describing Hans on the battlefield:

"Ah, this young blood, with its knapsacks and bayonets, its mud-befouled boots and clothing. We look at it, our humanistic aesthetic eye pictures it among scenes far other than these. . . . Alas, no, here they lie, their noses in fiery filth. . . . There is our friend, there is Hans Castorp. . . . A Hell hound is coming, a large explosive shell—he lies with his face in the cool mire. The product of a perverted science slopes upwards. Where it falls two youths had lain. . . . Now they are scattered, commingled, gone. . . . Up he gets, staggers on. Farewell, honest Hans Castorp . . . Life's delicate child! Your tale is told. . . . Moments there were when there came to thee a dream of love. Out of this universal feast of death, out of this extremity of fever kindling the rain-washed evening sky to a fiery glow, may it be that Love one day shall mount?"

The brothers Mann reveal the decay and dissolution of the old system of living; Thomas, through the philosophic portrayal of the thought of his characters and the ending of all their ideas and efforts in premature death; Heinrich, by ironic presenting of posing mediocrity, and dishonesty, as greatness in the leading citizens or military and governing classes. He is merciless in his ridicule of William the Second, his criticism amounts to burlesque at times. His Kaiser presents much the same picture as does that of Herbert Eulenberg in his recent book of biographies, *The Hohenzollerns*, in which the former Kaiser is dubbed "the most brilliant fraud ever wrapped in royal ermine!"

Thomas Mann is in closer accord with the method of Dostoievsky or Chekhov in his meticulous giving of detail which weighs always in the desired direction. He is somewhat more attuned to Galsworthy's pitying irony; he has something of the same tenderness for young Hans Castorp, for dying Settembrini, that Galsworthy has for young Bosinney and the gracious old Jolyon Forsyte, whose death is given in that Indian Summer Interlude—the most perfect part of the Forsyte Saga. All vanishes, all decays. There are, however, different kinds of passing into oblivion.

Ludovico Settembrini of *Der Zauberberg* and William Porphy Benham of Wells' *Research Magnificent* had the same yearnings from youth up for a world state. An aristocracy of the spirit has been Benham's aim always. His definition of such an aristocracy is a renunciation of self for service to bring the Kingdom of God to earth. His diagnosis of the disease of mankind is that of fear, indulgence, jealousy and prejudice as its component parts. Benham had travelled in many countries, seeking light and knowledge for his great mission. He is killed in 1913 in Johannesburg. In an impulsive effort to stop an attack of the soldiers upon the striking workmen, he rushes between the opposing sides, holding up a white flag of truce. He is shot and instantly dies. His life's dream is over. Negation and night come down upon the world for the next years of war's horror.

PAN-AMERICA IN THE COMING WORLD ORDER

by

Graham H. Stuart

Department of Political Science, Stanford University

"A famous European statesman visiting the headquarters of the Pan-American Union is said to have declared that if such an organization had existed in any of the European capitals in 1914 the World War would have been avoided."

In the interesting proposal by M. Briand for a United States of Europe, and in many of the suggestive letters received in reply, one notes as a sort of underlying and recurring motif the admonition that the states of Europe should cease dwelling upon the animosities and jealousies of the past when the need is so urgent to turn their attention to their common interests and requirements of the future.

The western hemisphere is fortunate in that not only has it fewer rivalries and hatreds of the past to forget but it possesses a common heritage of tradition and a fairly well established community of interests inclining towards a friendly cooperation in the future. The fact that all of the twenty-two American states were at one time colonies of Europe, that all except Canada obtained their independence within less than half a century's time, that all have constitutions based upon approximately the same ideals of democracy gives them what might be called a kindred background. Such a situation cannot be otherwise than advantageous in establishing a system of inter-American relationships based upon a sound foundation of mutual understanding and goodwill.

But the disillusioned post-war world exhibits little interest

or belief in things merely because they ought to be. The high sounding generalities and optimistic platitudes of the politician are blown away by the cold wind of facts and actualities. Enlightened selfishness is regarded as a more potent and satisfactory basis of permanent cooperation than ignorant idealism.

For this reason any attempt to visualize a new era of successful international relationship for the states of the western world requires an unbiased and accurate survey of the conditions which militate against satisfactory cooperation as well as those which encourage it. The difficulties of the problem must be given even more consideration than the factors working for it. The present article endeavors to sketch the existing situation in the American continents, pointing out the barriers to a satisfactory and successful political and economic relationship as well as the many avenues of approach which may make its achievement possible. A clear statement of the problem is the first step to its solution.

Perhaps the outstanding difficulty militating against successful political cooperation in the western hemisphere results from the preponderant situation which the United States occupies in population, wealth, and power. Although with the inclusion of Alaska, the United States possesses less than one-fourth of the total land in the two western continents, it has more than half the people, three-fourths of the wealth, and its power is practically immeasurable. Even Canada and the A.B.C. powers are oftentimes fearful and suspicious of their puissant and dominating neighbor. How much more difficult is the position of the weak states of the Caribbean, situated in what the United States has long asserted to be its sphere of influence?

Nor has the United States in word or deed followed a policy such as to exonerate it entirely from reasonable suspicions on the part of its neighbors. Mexico can hardly be expected to forget the annexation of Texas and California, Colombia has only recently and grudgingly accepted the loss of Panama, and the entire Caribbean region is still on tenter hooks as to when and where the United States will intervene next. If, as Mr. Olney

once said, "the United States is sovereign on this continent—its fiat is law upon subjects to which it confines its interposition" and the United States continues to be the sole interpreter of such a doctrine, a spirit of absolute confidence will never be established between the United States and her less powerful neighbors.

On the other hand even the most pessimistic chronicler of the relations between the United States and the other nations of the Americas can find few evidences of irretrievable wrongs. Texas had achieved her independence before she was annexed to the United States and Mexico exerted the most nominal control over the territories which she lost in the war with the United States. It has never been proved that the United States actually instigated the Panama revolution and the construction of the canal has benefited Colombia as much as it has the other west coast states of South America. Cuba is not satisfied with the Platt Amendment but rather because of a feeling of "amour propre" than because of any abuse of its provisions on the part of the United States. The United States has intervened often in the Caribbean region but the interventions have always been temporary except in the case of Haiti, and even here its word has been pledged to withdraw by 1936. Canada has settled every boundary dispute with her more powerful neighbor by arbitration and several of them with some considerable profit to herself. In fine, although the position and power of the United States make it a potentially dangerous neighbor, and its statesmen from time to time give utterance to doctrines of manifest destiny and American hegemony, in actual practice the policy of the United States has not been such as to prevent the realization of a Pan-American cooperation based upon mutual respect and fair dealing.

At this point the question naturally arises as to the significance of the Monroe Doctrine in evaluating possibilities for more friendly and closer cooperation in the Americas. The Monroe Doctrine in the past has had a certain sinister significance in the eyes of the Latin American peoples in spite of its beneficent influence upon various occasions. But its importance

either as a safeguard for the United States or as a menace to the other American nations is steadily upon the wane. Everyone will concede that the doctrine in its original form is completely obsolete. Colonization in the western hemisphere has long since ceased and post-war Europe possesses neither the desire nor the power to interfere with the governments established in America. But the doctrine has developed into an ever changing, ever renewed presidential policy. What can we say of the many and varied interpretations that a century has brought forth?

A careful study of the applications of the doctrine makes it easily demonstrable that in the varied applications, extensions and interpretations that have been cloaked by the phrase, the essential fabric is invariably self-protection. So clearly has this become evident that upon the occasion of the centenary of the doctrine, Secretary of State Hughes, in a speech before the American Bar Association declared specifically that the doctrine was not a policy of aggression but a policy of self-defence—an assertion of the principle of national security. Inasmuch as the right of self-protection is a corollary of sovereignty the United States would have to evolve such a doctrine even if we did not have it and other states have an equal right to formulate similar policies of their own. Under such circumstances, although the Monroe Doctrine is distinctly the policy of the United States and the United States reserves to itself its interpretation and application, such a doctrine is not necessarily prejudicial to other states. In fact Secretary Hughes reiterated what Senator Root and President Wilson had already stated categorically, that the doctrine does not infringe upon the independence and sovereignty of the other American states. As such, according to Secretary Hughes, the doctrine does not stand in the way of Pan-American cooperation, and the hearty participation of the United States in inter-American Conferences proves it.

The most recent declaration concerning the Monroe Doctrine has been made during the Hoover administration in a careful study made by J. Reuben Clark, Under-Secretary of State. He emphasizes again that the Monroe Doctrine occupies and bounds

a narrow portion of the broader doctrine of self-preservation—it is not equal to, but merely a part of, the doctrine of self-preservation. One statement in this presentation seems particularly important from the standpoint of the future relationships of the American nations. Secretary Clark says that the Monroe Doctrine relates solely to relationships between European states on the one side and American continents on the other, and does not apply to purely inter-American relations nor lay down principles to govern interrelationships of the states of the western hemisphere among themselves. If the American states will only accept this interpretation of the doctrine—which after all is returning to the original doctrine of President Monroe, this "traditional attitude of the United States concerning American questions commonly described as the Monroe doctrine" might well be regarded as advantageous even if somewhat archaic.

But conceding that we can thus reasonably dispose of the Monroe Doctrine as a barrier to future friendly cooperation in the western hemisphere, it is not so easy to eliminate the potential menace of American policy in the Caribbean area. A mere glance at the map shows the powerful position of the United States in this area. From the strategic standpoint it is an American lake powerfully protected at the angles of the equilateral triangle bounded by the naval base in Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, the heavily fortified Canal Zone, and Porto Rico, flanked by the well protected harbor of St. Thomas. From a political standpoint the United States possesses Porto Rico and the Virgin Islands, has what is equivalent to sovereignty over the Canal Zone, has a semi- or quasi-protectorate over Cuba, has a lease on the canal rights in Nicaragua as well as rights to establish a naval base on the Little and Great Corn Islands, has control of the government in Haiti, and maintains an armed force in Nicaragua. From the economic standpoint more than one-half of the total trade of the Caribbean area is done with the United States—in 1928 it amounted to almost half a billion dollars—and the investments of the United States in the area are valued at over a billion and three-quarters dollars.

The Caribbean region has well been called the American Empire, but the imperialistic aspects of the situation seem to be better appreciated by the Caribbean countries than by the United States. President Hoover has declared that true democracy is not and cannot be imperialistic, but the question has been raised as to whether true democracy exists in the United States, and the Caribbean countries might equally well inquire what constitutes imperialism. It must be confessed that although the policy of the United States in this area has been wholly incoherent, and to that extent no deep laid sinister program can be alleged, it can hardly be denied that we regard the area as completely subject to our sphere of influence. We have annexed territory there, settled boundary disputes, supervised elections, made and unmade governments, granted recognition at will, controlled finances and loans, established naval bases, and intervened as we saw fit. Even though at times the motive has been unselfish, *l'appétit vient en mangeant.*

In the picturesque and appropriate words of an authority on Latin America, "The people of the United States ought to face realities and leave off swallowing honeyed phrases that have a different taste perhaps in the Caribbean. A precise declaration of intention is needed—an expression of deliberate national will working on the basis of knowledge of the facts and an appreciation of the possible consequences. Rather than to allow the United States to continue resembling a glacier that in terrifying silence is slipping slowly and surely southward with scant prospect of melting as it goes, the simile of an avalanche might be preferable, at least it would have the advantage of enabling our Caribbean neighbors to see and hear it coming."

The recent developments of American policy in this region seem to indicate that the government of the United States has come to realize the desirability of a "precise declaration of intention," a definitely worked out Caribbean policy. It has been made abundantly clear in recent utterances by those guiding foreign policies that the Caribbean area is of most vital importance to the United States.

President Coolidge set forth the situation unequivocably: "Towards the government of countries which we have recognized this side of the Panama Canal we feel a moral responsibility that does not attach to other nations." Secretary Hughes declared it essential to our safety to protect the Panama Canal, its approaches and our freedom of communication. At the same time it has been stated to be the firm policy of the United States to respect the territorial integrity of all the American Republics; the return of the Isle of Pines to Cuba, the termination of our occupation of the Dominican Republic, the friendly settlement with Nicaragua, and the newly proclaimed promise to withdraw from Haiti, are specific and concrete evidences of it. President Hoover has asserted emphatically that we do not wish to be represented by marines in this region. But what is now needed is a definitely worked out, consistent program which shall make it clear to the world that the United States intends to pursue a rational and just policy in this region based upon mutual advantage and supported by mutual cooperation. Intervention must either cease or become a joint responsibility.

One other important barrier towards closer cooperation and more friendly feeling in the western hemisphere is the high protective policy of the United States. From the very beginning of their existence as independent republics the Latin American states have been excellent customers of the United States. At the beginning of the twentieth century our Latin American trade amounted to over $265,000,000 and at the outbreak of the World War it was averaging about three-quarters of a billion dollars. It might be noted in passing that in 1914 one-third of this volume of trade was with the island of Cuba, the only Latin American republic with whom the United States had a reciprocity treaty.

The World War gave the United States a great opportunity to monopolize the Latin American market regardless of its trade policies, and its average trade with the Latin American countries during the years 1921 to 1925 reached a figure of well over a billion and a half dollars. But as Europe gradually recovered, our commercial supremacy in Latin America began to

decline, and it is generally conceded that one of the reasons has been the hostility engendered, especially in certain South American states, by our provocative tariff policy.

At the third Pan-American Commercial Conference held in Washington in 1927 vigorous attacks were made upon what was declared to be the excessive tariffs levied by the United States on South American products and one of the resolutions looked toward the gradual reduction of high customs duties. At the sixth International American Conference held at Havana in 1928, the head of the Argentinian delegation, Dr. Pueyrredon, resigned from his position when he failed to secure in the convention for the reorganization of the Pan-American Union, a statement urging the leveling of tariff barriers in the interest of inter-American cooperation. During the preparation of the Hawley-Smoot tariff act of 1930 which would particularly affect trade with the countries of North and South America, Argentina, Bermuda, Canada, Cuba, Mexico and Uruguay threatened retaliatory action while the Bahama Islands, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Newfoundland, and Paraguay showed their attitude by vigorous protests to the State Department.

In the Caribbean area the United States tariff has become a most vital matter. In fact it is almost a question of life or death for the island of Cuba. The 20 per cent reduction which Cuba receives for the products of her soil in our tariff laws has been one of the principal reasons for the extraordinary development of the sugar industry there and has made Cuba's trade with the United States by far the largest of all the Latin American countries, second only to that of Canada in the western hemisphere. The elimination of this preference would be a financial disaster to Cuba. In fact the increase in the sugar duty in the recent tariff measure of the United States has brought about a serious economic situation due to the fact that it means an increase in the tariff on 88 per cent of total value of Cuban goods imported into the United States.

On the other hand Porto Rico enjoys free trade with the United States. As a result the commerce of this island, of which

more than 80 per cent is with the United States, jumped from a total of about $17,000,000 in 1901 to a total of about $200,000,000 in 1928, and its economic future seems assured.

The trade of Canada with the United States has ranked first in the western hemisphere ever since Canada obtained her dominion status. Since 1926 the United States has done more trade with Canada than with any other country in the world, reaching the stupendous total in 1929 of about one and one-half billion dollars, about 30 per cent of the total trade of the United States. Although this has been reached in spite of tariff walls the recent excessively high Hawley-Smoot tariff law has brought about a retaliatory tariff on the part of Canada which has already seriously affected the excellent trade relations between the two countries.

Political relationships are becoming more and more closely involved with economic relationships and artificial barriers which stifle the free exchange of commodities essential to the well being and prosperity of neighboring peoples are sources of friction and danger. The United States has achieved its present position of economic world supremacy largely through the fact that no trade barriers of any sort may be erected between the forty-eight states. It would seem to be a logical deduction that reciprocity arrangements between the other states of the western hemisphere would be equally advantageous. In fact the policy of retaliatory tariffs which has been instigated against the United States as a result of the high tariff law of 1930 has already reduced trade and contains the germs of a disastrous trade war. Enlightened self-interest and common sense would seem to advocate a policy of friendliness and goodwill between nations which are mutually dependent, and even the United States is not in a position to continue to disregard it.

The barriers of race, language, customs are oftentimes overemphasized as stumbling blocks to international cooperation. Problems arising from such factors are usually due to ignorance, and the constantly improving means of communication and transit, the ever increasing economic interdependence, are gradually eliminating these sources of difficulties.

Having noted the outstanding difficulties which face the American states in their outlook for closer future cooperation, we may now note certain factors which give substantial encouragement to such a hope.

In the first place no outstanding disputes remain to serve as potential breeding spots for future troubles. The Tacna-Arica question was undoubtedly the last major problem troubling the peace of the Americas and that seems to have at last been satisfactorily settled. The Christ of the Andes stands as evidence of an acceptable arrangement of the boundary between Argentina and Chile. A few boundary questions are still unsettled it is true, notably the ownership of the Chaco region between Bolivia and Paraguay, the Oriente controversy between Ecuador and Peru, and several minor questions between the Central American states. But such a consistent record has already been established in settling such disputes by arbitration, mediation, or good offices, that the few questions still outstanding will unquestionably be settled in the same peaceable fashion as have those of the past.

There is an abundance of machinery available for the peaceful settlement of disputes among the American states, and practically all are bound up by a network of treaties requiring it. For example, disregarding the obligations under the League of Nations, Argentina is bound by 33 arbitration treaties, Brazil by 42, Chile by 23, Peru by 17, Uruguay by 31 and the United States by 45. All the American states except Costa Rica and Honduras have signed the Hague Convention. Two-thirds of the American states have signed the protocol of the World Court, and half of these have accepted the optional clause. Canada and sixteen of the Latin American states are members of the League of Nations, and all of the states of the western hemisphere except Argentina, Brazil, and Bolivia have signed the Kellogg-Briand pact for the renunciation of war.

But undoubtedly the most important development for the elimination of war and the peaceful settlement of all disputes in the Americas are the two treaties for arbitration and conciliation

signed by twenty American states in Washington, January 5, 1929. The inter-American arbitration treaty is the most inclusive of its kind that has ever been signed in the western hemisphere. The signatory states agree to submit every dispute of a justiciable nature to arbitration except those within domestic jurisdiction and uncontrolled by international law and those affecting the interests of third states. Compulsory arbitration is specifically required for the interpretation of treaties, questions of international law, and the existence of facts which if established would constitute a breach of an international obligation and the nature and extent of the reparation therefor. This convention places all the states of the two Americas except Argentina and Canada upon exactly the same basis as those states which have accepted the optional clause requiring compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.[1]

The inter-American conciliation convention requires the submission of all non-justiciable questions to a standing commission of inquiry which has full powers not only to investigate and report upon the facts, but to act as a commission of conciliation and use every effort to settle the dispute amicably at any stage of the proceedings. During the year allowed for the investigation the disputing states are obliged to refrain from any warlike acts.

With these two conventions in operation it would seem that every type of dispute, justiciable and non-justiciable, might be settled in a fair and judicial manner. Coupled as they are to a declaration condemning war as an instrument of national policy they not only afford the American nations an established procedure for eliminating the use of force in the settlement of international controversies but they require that it be followed.

The nations of the western world have long appreciated the value of getting together in friendly conference. Bolívar in 1826 called a conference at Panama to establish "certain fixed principles for securing the preservation of peace between the nations

[1] Canada and ten of the Latin American Republics have signed the optional clause of the World Court.

of America," and suggested that an amphictyonic assembly be empowered to employ good offices, mediation or arbitration. He also urged the guarantees of territorial integrity based upon the status quo and the elimination of political and economic barriers. Although his ideas were in advance of his times his proposal for regular conferences bore fruit and the American Republics now meet from time to time in official conference and seek by means of resolution and treaties to effect better cooperation along economic, social, and political lines.

As one of the fruits of these conferences the American states have set up the Pan-American Union, an organization which serves as a motive power and coordinating force to see that the machinery of international cooperation in the western hemisphere is kept in workable condition. This organization, which has been functioning since 1888, might in its present form be appropriately termed a Pan-American League of Nations. It is controlled by a governing board composed of the Secretary of State of the United States and the diplomatic representatives in Washington of the twenty other American republics. It is administered by a director general chosen by this board. It not only compiles and distributes information regarding commerce, laws and general development of the American republics but also acts as a permanent commission of the international conferences of the American states, keeping records, assisting in obtaining ratification of treaties and conventions, and preparing the agenda of each conference. A famous European statesman visiting the headquarters of this organization in Washington is said to have declared that if such an organization had existed in any of the European capitals in 1914 the World War would have been avoided. And it might be noted that since its reorganization in 1906–07 no war between any two American republics has taken place.

At the present time the idea of regional understandings seems to be coincident with world organization in attempting to promote better international relationships. The Pan-American Union having proved its usefulness in a limited field might well

be extended to include Canada, and its political activities might be expanded to make such questions of recognition and intervention a joint responsibility. If this were done one of the greatest problems facing the United States in its relations with its less powerful neighbors would be satisfactorily settled.

The World War showed conclusively that American problems cannot be separated from European and Asiatic problems. Therefore even the best sort of organization and cooperation throughout the two Americas is not enough unless it be made equally cooperative with the rest of the world. The United States has shown its appreciation of this fact in its cooperation with Europe and Asia in naval limitation of armament and in its ardent support of an all-embracing world peace pact. For the same reasons all of the American nations should join both the World Court and the League of Nations and give their support to every other international agency offering a reasonable and practicable program for the maintenance of world peace.

Such a policy is not an idealistic Utopia, it is the quintessence of enlightened selfishness. In a famous speech made at Rio de Janeiro in 1906, Secretary of State Elihu Root made one of the greatest expositions of the vital need of mutual and sympathetic understanding among the American nations: "No nation can live unto itself and continue to live. Each nation's growth is a part of the development of the race—There is not one of all our countries that can not benefit the others; there is not one that will not gain by the prosperity, the peace, the happiness of all—let us help each other to show that for all races of men the liberty for which we have fought and labored is the twin sister of justice and peace—so shall come security and prosperity, production and trade, wealth, learning, the arts, and happiness for us all." No better international bill of rights could be drawn for the nations of the two Americas in their more intimate and complex relationships under the coming world order.

The second contribution to a symposium on "The Coming World Order" edited by Archie M. Palmer.

CONFUCIUS AND THE WAR LORDS

'Round the World Log of a Sociologist—III

by

HERBERT A. MILLER

Department of Sociology, Ohio State University

EVERYONE who has ever heard of Confucius even vaguely has a kind of respect for China, but when he reads of the war lords he thinks only with impatience of the country which permits them to exist. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of China however much the medieval militarists may flourish and ravage the land.

We should never forget that one-fourth of the whole population of the world lives in this one country with a unity, in spite of the press news, that is greater than exists, with rare exceptions, anywhere else among the sixty odd nations into which the other three-fourths of human kind is divided.

Beyond the confusion that seems to dominate China, there is something far more important to be reckoned with.

First, there are the numbers, four hundred and more millions —nearly four times the population of the United States.

Second, there is age. China was already old when Greece and Rome, which we consider ancient, were yet unborn. Nations have risen and their glories departed while China has gone continuously on. Now, when the world is entering into a new era of organization and interrelationship, old China is having a sort of glandular operation which is renewing her youth.

Third, there is the philosophy of China which commands the respect of the outside world, and has so permeated the Chinese people that it is inseparable from them. Even the streets in country villages are named after the virtues which were magnified by Confucius.

Fourth, there is the shock and stimulus that resulted when this vast mass of people, with the momentum of age and philosophy, came into contact with the new and up-start science, philosophy, ethics, business and political systems of the West.

These forces are all plus the war lords who worry even their own people and, unfortunately, furnish the press with most of its news from China.

There are soldiers everywhere in China. Where I am staying, just outside Peking, at five in the morning bugles begin to blow all around me, and when I go in the street I am meeting or passing soldiers all the time. Military events happen so rapidly that any news except that by cable, and even that, is out of date before it can be read. Yet the strange paradox exists that China is the least military nation in the world. The Negro Spiritual which runs "Aint goin' to study war no mo' " must be sung in the West until a new spirit evolves, but it is not needed in China. When the heroic Roosevelt was trying to rouse America to a warlike spirit, he could say nothing more insulting than we were in danger of becoming "Chinafied." In spite of recent events this interpretation of China still holds good.

The explanation of this contradictory situation is Confucius. How fortunate this is for the rest of the world cannot be measured. If a military China should let loose its masses in a career of conquest nothing could stop her, but Confucius, twenty-five hundred years ago, put a check on any such possibility.

There have always been wars and warriors in China but they were never for glory, and it has never been possible to magnify them by monuments. Confucius outlined a moral system which became the guide of life for all China. In it he puts the career of the scholar at the top and that of the soldier at the bottom.

In the West, history, literature, painting, sculpture, and legend have taught us that our liberty, our self-respect and our virtues came from military activity. Even the Western religion had Hebrew prophets who were mighty warriors as well as spiritual leaders. They slew their tens of thousands and we are

expected to admire them for it. Almost every community in Europe and America has statues to military heroes or military heroism. In all of China there is not one such statue.

In Japan the feudal system, which lasted until recent times, put a premium on military qualities. In China the feudal system has long been abolished.

The ideals of only two men dominate China today: Confucius, who died more than five hundred years before Christ, and Dr. Sun Yat-Sen, who died in 1921. There has been much wandering from the paths laid down by Confucius, but his writings are the classics to which all Chinese turn for their inspiration. Dr. Sun did much fighting, but the formal ritual of bowing to his picture and reading the injunctions of his "Will," which is performed in every school and civic gathering throughout the country, emphasize rights within China, not aggression without.

Why and what, then, are war lords? There are big war lords and little ones. To name them all to the Western reader would be a jumble of incomprehensible Chinese names, and only the leaders are really important, and even their days are numbered.

In 1911, China, which had been a monarchy for thousands of years, suddenly became a republic, at least in name. It had, of course, been impossible for the great mass of people to get either the idea or the habit of self-government, and down to 1921 a more or less chaotic government had gone on by momentum from the past. Then the old figures began to pass from the stage, and the confusion which followed the Great War, together with aggression by the Japanese, created a new situation.

There was no new machinery for either central or local government, no constitution and no system of election; yet life had to go on. Manchuria was a part of China which had never been fully integrated with the rest, and it was very much desired by the Japanese. The central government was too weak to control it, so that in a way it depended on whoever was able to rule it. This proved to be Chang Tso-Lin, about whom the world has heard much. He is generally described as an original bandit who rose to power.

Chang Tso-Lin started life as a village horse doctor. He was a small, delicate person who was asked to take the leadership in the community when lawlessness raged; he organized a group of men much like our vigilantes who used to keep order in the turbulent days of our own West. Manchuria, to which over twenty-five million immigrants from the rest of China have gone in the last thirty years, had more than one resemblance to our West of seventy-five years ago. Chang was so successful in his activities that he was asked by wider and wider areas to give them protection. He thus built up an organization which, in a very primitive way, gave him eventually complete control over Manchuria. At first the Japanese were able to use him, but he became harder and harder to manage. Two years ago he had expanded his area to include Peking, but the pressure of another war lord, Feng, the "Christian General," became so strong that Chang withdrew to Mukden, his capital; as the train entered the city it was blown up and he was killed.

He was succeeded by his son Chang Hsueh-Liang, only twenty-eight years old, possessing more modern ideas than his father, but not having been proved by the fire of experience. When I went to call on him at his villa, I found an affable young man dressed for golf who talked with great enthusiasm about the new national university nearby of which he is a patron. A fine tennis court was being built in the garden but the whole place was surrounded, first by a high mesh wire fence, then by three strands of barbed wire, and inside this a high-tension electrified fence. Thus are the old and the new brought together. His power is not as personal as that of his father, because the next stage has already appeared. He symbolizes law and order under a system which works but does not have a formal legal status. He is rich with money gained according to the rules of the game which prevail in China, while in the West we have men who are richer, but whose rules are different. No one expects the system to last long, but in the meantime there is an argument of justification, since the alternative might be chaos.

The other three men who qualify as war lords are Feng, Yen

and Chiang Kai-Shek. Feng is a primitive Puritan whose character offers some parallels to Oliver Cromwell. He has worked up from the bottom and commands the respect of those attached to him. He is undoubtedly narrow in some of his ideals, but he has been an efficient soldier who believes that swords should be made into plowshares. He has had a place in the central government, but, not approving certain policies, withdrew. Both Feng and Yen, though not old men, do represent more of the simplicity and integrity of the old order than their functions as war lords would indicate. Yen has long been governor of Shansi Province where his title as the "model Governor" is comparable with Feng's title as "Christian." These two men have strong military forces which are a threat even when not in action against anything with which they disagree. Neither of them can be said to love war for its own sake or its conquests for what they may get out of it. Whatever may be their judgment as to details, there seems to be no doubt but that their real interest is China.

The case of Chiang Kai-Shek is somewhat different. He showed his calibre as a soldier while helping Dr. Sun in the revolution. His armies won so many victories, either by fighting or by propaganda, that a central government which has been established has been looked upon by all of China as the real government. It has command of the national army which it has tried to substitute for the armies of local generals. Since there is no parliamentary government in China, there is no way of getting change of administration without a show of force or of public opinion. On the other hand, the way to stay in office is by the possession of still greater force and the control of public opinion.

China owes much to Chiang Kai-Shek, and he is the President of the Republic; technically, chairman of the government. He has no precedents or constitutional checks; he has made mistakes and perhaps undergone changes in his own character. His method of rule has been more orderly but not altogether unlike that of the war lords.

No one knows what will be the personnel of the government a few weeks or a few months hence, but as against the system of war lords, I assert with a good deal of confidence, that in the end Confucius and Dr. Sun will win against them. And this end is not far distant.

Confucius, by his ethics, made China an unconsciously unified people. Sun was the dominant figure in giving them the consciousness of a unified nation. This unity is now so strong, both unconsciously and consciously, that there is no force on earth that can break it. The people hate war and despise the soldier, and endure them only while they must.

The national movement is symbolized by a program laid down by Dr. Sun. There is only one party, the Kuomintang, which is both the national movement and the government. Differences of opinion must express themselves within the party, and though there is the widest difference of opinion, those who differ express allegiance to the same party principles. These principles include both an insistance on a program that will bring national self-respect and on a policy of social reconstruction.

The people of the country are fairly unanimous about the first but they differ about the second, and about whether the persons in power are using the best methods for securing either.

There is another group of significant personalities in the members of the Soong family. The widow of Sun Yat-Sen is the most valiant defender of the left-wing interpretation of her husband's program. She is intelligent and able and has displayed a remarkable character. One of her sisters is the wife of the president, another of a cabinet minister, and her brother is the brilliant T. V. Soong, minister of finance. Mrs. Sun accuses them all of betrayal of the ideals which they have professed. They claim that complicated problems must be dealt with by compromise.

Confucius furnished the fundamentals which more than anything else have made China what she is and preserved her through the ages. The present leaders are modernists, but modernism merely builds upon what already exists. There is such

an awareness of pressing problems that there seems to be a neglect of the old; this old, however, has so thoroughly permeated the masses, that they will not lose it before the inevitable return to it comes.

The rampant nationalism that now dominates China, however much it may turn to the West for its new ideas, must find some symbol to justify its claim to rights and distinction; this symbol it will find in the core of what is characteristically Chinese, namely, the lofty philosophy and moral code of Confucius, though modified enough to admit birth control and other demands of modern life.

The positiveness with which the above assertions have been made may sound like the free ranging of an optimistic imagination, but to one who feels the pulse of China there is an inescapable confidence in the deeper tendencies which not only can be felt but here and there also seen.

War lords are a rapidly passing incident. There is no possibility of developing militarism among this vast people. For the moment ideas are pouring into China from the West. Some day, not far distant, when the synthesis between East and West has been completed, the soul of China will pour back into the West a spirit from its long experience and noble thinking, something that the West will be glad to imitate.

THE QUEST OF WORLD PEACE

by

DEXTER PERKINS

Department of History and Government, University of Rochester

PEACE BY PROMISES

IN MY last article I analyzed for my readers the famous treaties of Locarno. These treaties, as is perfectly clear, represent in striking form the dominant European viewpoint with regard to the preservation of peace. They are based upon the principle that aggression must be punished; that war wantonly begun is an international crime; that common action must be taken to prevent its occurrence; that force may be rightfully used to put down disturbances against the existing order. The scope of the treaties of Locarno is restricted, it is true; the principles involved in them are fully applied only in the case of a part of Western Europe; but no one can doubt that they embody a way of looking at the problem of international peace which is widely held on the other side of the Atlantic.

In the United States, however, up to the present time at least, a different attitude has prevailed. This country has, of course, never associated itself, as indeed it could hardly be expected to associate itself, with the treaties of Locarno; it has even held back from the far more restricted type of international punitive action laid down in the Covenant of the League. Its official policy has been bottomed upon neither one nor the other of these instruments, but has been best expressed in the famous Kellogg Pact for the outlawry of war.

In preceding numbers of *World Unity*, I traced the actual negotiations which led to the consummation of the Kellogg Pact. It is not perhaps necessary to traverse this same ground again. The essential principle of the pact is easy enough to understand. The

nations signatory to it (and this includes all the great nations of the world), pledge themselves to renounce war "as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another," and furthermore agree, in Article II, that "the settlement of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

That the nations of the world should agree to such a compact is impressive evidence of the widespread sentiment in favor of international peace. The existence of the Kellogg treaty will, no doubt, provide a focus for the public opinion of the world in an international crisis. For the first time in history war has been put outside the ban of the law so far as it is "an instrument of national policy." No reasonable man will depreciate this achievement.

But, at the same time, we should not be led to exaggerate it. Mr. Kellogg, in the course of the negotiations which led to the signature of the pact which bears his name, more than once declared that the right of self-defense must still be regarded as existent, and with equal emphasis indicated that he did not believe that what constituted self-defense could or ought to be explicitly defined. Yet the importance of this question is obvious to anyone who views the events of the present in the light of the past. Historically speaking, nations have almost invariably justified their resort to war on the ground that their vital interests were endangered, and that a sacred duty of self-preservation dictated the taking up of the sword. In the name of self-defense most interventions take place in the affairs of troubled or backward states; in the name of self-defense nations attack other nations, claiming that it is necessary, as a matter of security, to strike the first blow; in the name of self-defense provocative military and naval programs are brought forward and carried into effect. Only the most through-going non-resistant will deny the existence of the right mentioned; but in the absence of a criterion for determining when and where this right is involved it seems only reasonable to expect that the integrity of the Kellogg Pact may from time to time be severely threatened.

Mr. Kellogg, in answer to any such criticism, would no doubt answer that in each specific instance arising under the Pact, the public opinion of the moment would provide the solution of this problem. Yet it is not easy in an international crisis to attain an accurate view of things. The air is filled with passion, and what is even worse than passion, with intentional misrepresentations; the sources of public opinion are poisoned; and the doubts and confusions which result prevent the expression, in all its majesty, of the wide-spread sentiment for international peace.

Nor is this all. Suppose, indeed, that public sentiment does speak out in no uncertain terms, what then? There is not a line in the Kellogg Pact which prescribes a course of action; and so far as the terms of this important treaty are concerned, there is nothing to indicate that the nation which violates it will suffer in any material way for the most clear-cut and indisputable violation. Will moral force alone suffice to bring a law-breaking nation to terms? Can the rest of the world stand by and see the wanton breach of this great compact, and yet take not the slightest action of any kind?

There are, then, two important questions raised by the Kellogg treaty; first, is it not possible to provide machinery which will make its violation more difficult, and more susceptible of definition? and second, is it not possible to agree upon some measure of common action when a violation has been definitely determined to exist?

A partial, though by no means a complete, answer to the first of these questions has already been furnished. The nations signatory to the Covenant of the League are obligated, as my readers know, to submit their disputes either to arbitration or conciliation before resort to war. The breach of this obligation might reasonably be considered a clear breach of the Kellogg Pact as well. Moreover, this principle of the Covenant has been incorporated also in a large number of conciliation treaties negotiated by the United States and duly ratified by the Senate. It may be regarded, therefore, as applicable in the widest sense of the term.

Of course this principle does not settle everything. Under the

League Covenant war is permissible after conciliation has failed; under the Kellogg Pact it is not. What criterion of self-defense shall be established in these instances? We have no answer to the question. And even in cases falling within the terms of the Covenant or the American conciliation treaties the term "resort to war" needs definition. Are interventions, such, for example, as our interventions in Haiti or Nicaragua, a resort to war? Not all persons would give the same answer to this question.

With regard to the second question, as to what action shall be taken against a clear-cut violation of the Kellogg Pact, the situation is today most unsatisfactory. How unsatisfactory it is may be shown in a recent proposal of the President of the United States. In his last message to Congress Mr. Hoover renewed a proposal for the exemption from capture of food-stuffs in time of war. Yet suppose that some government wantonly violated the Kellogg treaty, and thus created a state of war. Would the President propose that it be supplied with food-stuffs which would aid it in carrying on this act of aggression? Would he make no distinction between feeding the aggressor, and the aggressed? How much moral authority would remain to the peace pact itself, if, in a case that admitted of no doubt, the law-breaking state were treated on exactly the same basis as the state which suffered from the breach? Is it possible to avoid the conclusion that implicit in the compact which we are discussing is an overturning of the old conceptions of neutrality, and the substitution of a new legal order? I, for one, cannot see how the old conceptions of complete impartiality between two belligerents, or groups of belligerents, can be reconciled with such a concept as the outlawry of war. Whatever may be our stand today, we must sooner or later face the implications involved in the great compact to which we have put our names, or be prepared to witness its break-down in fact.

This is not to say that we must accept without reservation the conception of peace guaranteed by force. There is a middle ground on which it may prove feasible to stand, and towards which, perhaps, we are slowly moving. We might, for example, forbid the flotation of loans, or the export of materials of war, to

any nation violating the Kellogg Pact. We might forbid the vessels of such a law-breaking state to have recourse to our harbors. We might interdict all communication with an aggressor nation. We might apply a kind of economic pressure, of varying degrees of stringency. The possibilities of action in this field are suggested in a broad way by Article 16 of the League Covenant; the sketching of a scheme of economic pressure in more definite and practicable terms is certainly not an impossibility, with the cooperation of the United States. Might we not even acquiesce in a League blockade, in a case where the issue was clearly defined?

Recognition of the fact that some kind of positive obligation naturally flows from the Kellogg Pact seems sooner or later inevitable. This explains the discussion of the idea of a so-called consultative treaty. Such a treaty would bind its signatories, not to any definite course of action, but to common counsel, in case the pact were violated. It would provide a means by which the questions involved in a breach of the treaty might be immediately considered, and if unanimity developed as to the existence of such a breach, means of common action might be devised. Such a treaty, it is clear, is by no means adequate. It would leave action to be devised in each emergency, instead of providing for sound general principles on which to proceed; but it would, of course, be something of a step forward. And the very discussion of it is a hopeful sign that the limitations of the Kellogg compact as a complete solution of the problem of war are coming more and more to be perceived by thoughtful men.

In the last analysis, human progress depends upon freedom of consent, and upon the great movements of opinion; peace machinery is less important than the peace spirit. The solemn pledges of the Kellogg pact are a valuable rallying point for those movements of opinion, and for the peace spirit itself. But their very solemnity seems to make it imperative that we should not permit them wantonly to be set aside; and that the way should be found not only to visit upon an aggressor nation the moral denunciation of the world, but also to refuse to it at least some of the means of support for persisting in its aggression.

LEAVES OF THE GREATER BIBLE

Compiled and Edited by

WILLIAM NORMAN GUTHRIE

Rector, St. Mark's in-the-Bouwerie, New York

PART VI

BUDDHIST PRAYERS

PRAYER FOR THE PRESENCE OF BUDDHA

O, would that our own Teacher,
And our merciful Father and Lord,
Might descend to this sacred place
And be present with us, even us,
Who fulfill now the duties of our religion.
Would that the great, illimitable, compassionate Heart,
Moved by our invocations,
Were present now to receive these oblations at our hands!
May the omniscient and omnipotent Redeemer
Come, even now come among us,
And remove from us all impurity!

CHANT OF PURIFICATION

Hail, thou ever present Redeemer,
who hast perfected righteousness and art possessed of great mercy,
who art manifested throughout the universe
for the protection and defense of all creatures,
and who leadest to the attainment of boundless wisdom . . .
who dispellest all troubles,
even diseases and ignorance,
who art ever able to answer prayer . . .
who removest all doubt,

who art possessed of infinite spiritual power—
beyond the capacity of language to express!
Behold, we adore Thee accordingly
and worship Thee with one heart and with one mind.

All hail, great, compassionate Redeemer!
May I soon attain to possessing the eyes of Divine wisdom,
May I soon pass over the sea of sorrow,
May I speedily attain unto holiness,
May I reach at length Nirvana!

Though I were cast on the mountain of knives,
They should not hurt me;
Though thrown in the midst of the lake of fire,
It should not burn me.
Though hurled to the lowest hell,
It should not hold me;
Though hungry ghosts surround me,
They should not harm me.
Though exposed to the power of wicked spirits,
Their malice should not reach me.
Though transformed among the lowest forms of life,
I should attain to the highest wisdom in the end!

BUDDHA'S PRAYER FOR ENLIGHTENMENT

Unveil, O thou who givest sustenance to the worlds
From whom proceedeth all and unto whom it shall in the end return.
All hail! O unveil
Of the one True Sun
That Face,
Now hidden by yon Vase of golden light,
So we may fully know the Truth,
And do our duty whole,
On this our wayfaring
Toward thy sacred seat of glory!

PRAYER TO THE ENTHRONED BUDDHA

Thou in whom innumerable beings believe!
Thou, Buddha, Victor over the hosts of evil!

Thou, all-wise Being condescend to our world!
O Thou, made perfect, and glorified by innumerable trials,
Ever pitiful, ever gracious toward all creatures!

Look down upon us, for the time hath come
To pour out freely thy blessing on all creatures.
Be gracious unto us from thy throne
Builded high in thy heavenly world.

Thou art the eternal redemption of all creatures,
Therefore bow thee down unto us
With all thy unstained heavenly societies!

THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

by

John Herman Randall, Jr.
Department of Philosophy, Columbia University

M. Edouard Herriot, college professor, publicist, politician, and most radical Premier of France since the war, has written a detailed explanation of the plan for a United States of Europe proposed last year by his friend and colleague, M. Briand.* He undertakes to defend the Briand memorandum of May, 1930, against the various criticisms raised, that it is just another plan for a superstate, that it is hostile to British imperial interests, that it is directed against the United States; above all, that it is impossibly idealistic in seeking to abolish tariffs within a European customs union. M. Herriot is honest enough to admit there is some truth in all these contentions. But for him, none is essential, and all are subordinate to the absolute necessity for further European co-operation, for a rationalized and ordered Europe. His argument is hardheaded and realistic, and proceeds from the economic unification of European life already in existence and rapidly extending itself. "For our part we do not believe that it would be wise to work from the political idea towards the economic. We should follow a reverse process, and an observation of the facts and of the laws of European economy ought to lead us to new political conceptions." The greater part of his book is a demonstration that these facts demand a closer European federation, within the framework of the League of Nations.

"The public man of our day would be unequal to his task if he failed to perceive behind the mask of political facts, the hard economic truth. More and more the perturbed producers

*Edouard Herriot, *The United States of Europe.* Viking Press. 330 pp. $3.50.

are coming together, technicians join their efforts, enterprises amalgamate. National concentration is an essential condition of agreement between various nations. Already the League has recognized and declared that the remedy for the visible evils where sugar and coal are concerned is an international one. Whether we consider the amalgamation of raw steel and its derivatives, the Franco-German potash agreement, or any of the cartels we have cited, we find European interpenetration everywhere. The new American tariffs, we hope, will only accentuate this movement toward solidarity. Europe is not threatening any other land. She wants only to live, and she cannot live without union. Political theories must bow to that primordial necessity."

This European understanding proposed by MM. Briand and Herriot is rendered necessary by the laws of economic evolution, by industrial amalgamations, and by the necessity of defending the European market. It must be a regional agreement within the League, it must be open to all nations willing to enter, including Great Britain with her world interests, Russia, in whose case "political considerations are of no permanent importance," and Turkey. It may well copy the form taken by the Pan-American Union, it must be flexible and patient, it must organize European credit, it must work toward the suppression of tariff barriers as the end, not the beginning, of an economic organization of Europe.

M. Herriot feels that Europe will be lost economically if she tries to continue her old policy of "national small shopkeeping." Faced by overproduction and a rapidly decreasing market in transoceanic lands themselves in a process of rapid industrialization, Europe must set about a conscious "rationalization" of her economic life. Production must be restricted by international agreement. "Concentration and specialization are demanded by the necessity of order, and they can only be injurious for workers and consumers if the organization is rudimentary or sporadic. What America has been able to do, Europe can and ought to do. In America abuses disappeared at once when the amalgamated industries found themselves faced with

the representatives of a public authority determined to protect the general interest. The trusts became modified and ceased to be monopolies, limiting themselves to the attempt to achieve success by the employment of the most effective methods of production." M. Herriot is rather optimistic as to American public regulation of industry! But, he insists, the great European cartels now pay no attention to national boundaries, and regulation must likewise be international and European in scope.

These cartels are not sufficient to guarantee peace in their present form, but they do introduce order, which is essential to peace if not enough to secure it. The author lists thirty such cartels: aluminum, calcium carbide, charcoal, cement, dyestuffs, enamel, electric products, steel, linen, linoleum, potash, rayon, mercury, matches, copper, zinc, sugar, benzol, motion pictures, marble, nitrate, phosphates, locks, stearine, bottles, calcium nitrate, cyanamide, films, railway cars, and ferro-tungsten. All include the leading European producing states.

M. Herriot goes on to examine the various international economic agreements concerning communications, auto roads, canals, rivers, railways, posts, telegraphs, telephones, radio. He considers the internationalization of credit and finances, including the Bank for International Settlements; various labor agreements; and public health conventions. He concludes with "the rôle of the mind," such organizations as the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation. He vigorously denies that such cooperative effort will produce a standardization of national cultures. Indeed, the themes of present literature and art, now showing signs of exhaustion, may be rejuvenated by the vision of a united Europe, and once again a great cultural force, like the Renaissance or the Enlightment or Romanticism, may display a spectrum of national rays.

"Can this Europe, whom so many writers would obstinately divide, find great minds to show her common interest and duty, and to seek convergence where others are so stubbornly determined to see only divergent elements? The divergence is only an accident, providing history with the anecdotes by which it

lives; war itself is only a sanguinary news item. The convergence is seen in the silent daily acts of so many human beings united to one another by the same manner of feeling, of suffering, and of thinking. The mediocre mind amuses itself with the play of appearances; who will reveal to us the underlying identity of reality? Who will make us understand that the children in the schools of Europe would be naturally disposed to brotherhood if the traditional education did not train them to take arms each man against his neighbor?"

In contrast to these economic and intellectual forces making for European unity, stands the failure of the effort to establish a political customs union directly. The Economic Conference of 1927 made high-sounding recommendations for abolishing tariff barriers. But the Tariff Conference of 1930 got nowhere. "Let us be frank: so long as the declarations of a World Economic Conference remained in the domain of theory there were plenty of plaudits for them. Acting upon them was a different matter! Each nation was ready to agree to sacrifice—on the part of its neighbor." The result was an agreement not to raise *protective* tariffs—for two months! Yet at least there was recognition that tariff policies are interdependent, and not of exclusively national concern. No, the customs barrier is an effect, not a cause. Customs reform can only be the result of a European reorganization. And M. Herriot suggests the interesting thesis that big business in Europe, through its cartels, will eventually unify the economic life of the continent, leaving only small groups still anxious to maintain tariff advantages. Protection will be left the policy of the disappearing small producer; the basic organizations will find it meaningless.

Political unification, even through the abolition of tariffs, must be left to time. "The understanding between European nations must be upon the basis of entire political independence." It must destroy neither the national nor the international framework. It must be "a union of States, not a unity in which the sovereignties would be swallowed up." And yet that sovereignty would not be absolute. Such sovereignty has already vanished,

if it ever existed. "More and more the international control of industrial groups and cartels is developing; international understandings for canals, railways, posts, automobile routes, respond increasingly to ever-growing needs; social reform measures, insurance and protection of workmen, are supplemented by treaties extending their benefits to outsiders living within the frontiers. . . . There is already an international law and a League of Nations imposes its measures on each State." The Kellogg Pact has reduced the essential traditional sovereign right of appeal to arms. Let us freely guarantee sovereignty to member states, confident that facts will tell against theory. M. Herriot makes much of the American union of "sovereign states," and hopes that Europe will follow that example.

The American, and especially the American business man, while applauding this plea for a rationalized Europe, will naturally be interested in its economic effect on his own country. M. Herriot does not attempt to conceal the fact that European economic unification is being forced by the competition of America. Federation is necessary if a disunited Europe is not to be defeated in advance. Her hegemony, financial and industrial, has already been checked. Greece fell to Rome because she did not federate in time. This is the constant refrain, the background of all the European cartels. Yet does even the most short-sighted American exporter really want Europe to commit economic suicide? The author quotes from Wall Street journals welcoming a stiffer European competition. The United States of Europe is not to be thought of, he insists, as "aimed against the United States of America." It is not in the least a question of setting a European imperialism against an alleged American imperialism. "What we seek to organize is not a *struggle*, but an *equilibrium*." After all, he quotes approvingly from the *New York Herald Tribune*, the old continent simply wishes to attempt what America has already done.

"The immediate result of the work carried on for some years is no doubt the assured operation for the future of a vast cartel for continental Europe; there is, however, a still larger plan, the

framework for which is already prepared, that of an organization comprising the whole world, with British and American producers (of steel) in the first place." Thus reports the League of Nations on the Continental Steel Cartel. Is not this the answer? Will not European and American industrial organizations join hands, at first to parcel out the world between them, and then more organically? Can economic groups remain on a purely European level? Is not such attainment preliminary to a world rationalization? Would America prefer to deal with a host of shifting national European economic policies, or to treat with one unified policy, ensuring stability and peace? Suppose that the United States of Europe combined free trade within her limits with a high tariff wall around them? Could Americans justly complain? The ways of God are mysterious, and perhaps the American tariff may succeed in unifying Europe far beyond the hopes of the League of Nations!

There remains Great Britain, which gave the most hostile response to the Briand suggestion. Britain has a similar plan of her own, Empire Free Trade, which comes into violent collision with MM. Briand and Herriot. They naturally detest the Beaverbrook press, and look with favor on Keynes, Brailsford, and the *Economist*. "We French democrats may look, therefore, to the great English nation, which we admire so much, for a cooperation without which we cannot work effectively for peace or for liberty." Alas, the great English nation has still to make up its own mind! Meanwhile M. Herriot is frigidly polite to Mussolini, and disposes of his demand for disarmament as a preliminary to federal union: "Europe cannot without great injury to herself subordinate the question of organization, without which she cannot continue to live, to even the most laudable political solutions."

"We shall be told," concludes M. Herriot, "that this scheme of the French pacifists is inspired by a secret desire to secure a lasting hegemony for their country. To those who hold this view, we would reply that France is both an agricultural and an industrial nation, her home resources are supplemented by her over-

seas possessions, she has no unemployment. By general consent she is, in virtue of her geographical position, her political stability, and her economic endowment, the nation best qualified to be self-sufficing. If national egotism prevailed, and if our plan of European understanding were rejected in favor of the old conception of the balance of power to which we owe so many evils, French statesmen would have to remember these facts. Believe it or not, the efforts of the French Republic spring from her respect for the principles of the Revolution and the doctrines of democracy, and from her hope that Europe will at last accept a regime of free activity under the reign of equality and peace."

MM. Briand and Herriot are French politicians, and their oratory need not cause immediate suspicion of their sincerity. Dr. Stresemann took the proposal, whatever its motives, with great seriousness, and M. Benês, of Czechoslovakia, an old hand in regional understandings, whose Little Entente M. Herriot points to as a model, surely spoke the truth when he commented, "The only issue for us today is this: either we work to form a sort of new union between European States and nations, as much from the moral point of view as the economic and political, and we establish the closest and most permanent collaboration possible, or else we shall always be living in danger of difficulties, conflicts, and perpetual crises, ending in wars and catastrophes in which European culture will be submerged."

ROUND TABLE

The best possible argument for the World Court is a personal visit to one of its sessions, especially if accompanied by one who can explain its functions, disclose its organization and methods and point out its various powers and influences in terms of concrete situations. Such a visit is offered each reader of *World Unity* this month, with no less a guide and interpreter than the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, *Mr. Charles Evans Hughes*, with whose kind permission we reprint (in two instalments) the address delivered before the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on January 16, 1930.

A World Court instituted by the governments existing one hundred years ago might indeed have been an evil perversion of a great ideal, because most governments at that time were controlled, openly or secretly, by elements committed to exploitation at home no less than abroad. The instinctive terror of some American statesmen for a World Court at this time means either that they are *emotionally colonial* or that they have reason to fear any true standard of justice applied to human affairs.

But the World Court, as a social function, cannot be destroyed by legislation, or lack of legislation, by the American Senate. It is merely postponed, and the offices the Court could render with knowledge, wisdom and responsibility will be performed otherwise, by default, with ignorance, prejudice and irresponsibility on the bench.

The issue is more than election to participate in an International Tribunal: it is decision whether society, like individual man, shall live and develop through faithfulness to standards, or go down to despicable ruin through blind self-will. Since the people pay the price, the people bear full responsibility for the results of all political maneuvers at Washington and other seats of government.